Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

1.90
U5H51

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
★ SEP 19 1941 ★
U.S. Department of Agriculture

AGRICULTURE'S PLANS TO AID IN DEFENSE AND MEET THE IMPACTS OF WAR

A Summary of Reports of State Agricultural Planning Committees

U. S. Department of Agriculture
July 23, 1941

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Washington, D. C.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We are attaching for your consideration a copy of "Agriculture's Plans to Aid in Defense and to Meet the Impacts of War." This document is the result of the efforts to summarize those recommendations of the State Agricultural Planning Committees that have a particular bearing upon the work of the Department.

It is based upon the work of 775 farm men and women, assisted by 1739 administrative and technical workers of State, Department and other federal agencies. The work of the State Committees, in turn, was built upon that of thousands of farmer members of county agricultural planning committees.

The whole effort is in response to your memorandum to all Bureau Chiefs dated January 8, 1941. This memorandum, you will recall, was a request for cooperation on the part of all agencies in working with State Committees to develop by June 1, 1941 first approximations to answers to the series of questions relating to ways and means by which agriculture might meet the impacts of the war and the need for national defense.

B. E. S. NOV 3 1941

We feel that the activities of these committees represent a significant first step in developing a unified agricultural program.

Cooperation of the various agencies of the Department at county, State and national levels has been of the highest order. In fact, it is questionable whether any group of governmental agencies ever cooperated in any common effort more wholeheartedly and with less consciousness of jurisdictional lines than was the case in this activity. Both because of the fine spirit of cooperation that prevailed throughout the work of State and regional committees and because of the broad base from which the recommendations in the attached document are drawn, we urge that you give them your most careful consideration.

Very truly yours,

H. R. Tolley

Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

M. L. Wilson

Director of Extension Work.

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION.	1
II.	CURRENT DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS	4
	1. Special Defense Situations	4
	2. Health and Nutrition	5
	3. Education and Information	7
	4. Farm Labor	8
	5. Forestry	10
	6. Soil Conservation.	12
	7. Water Utilization.	12
	8. Range Utilization.	13
	9. Production, Prices, and Farm Management. . .	15
	10. Marketing and Distribution, including transportation	16
	11. Pan-American Relations	17
	12. Agricultural Finance	18
III.	PLANNING FOR THE POST-WAR PERIOD.	19
IV.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUING AND ROUNDING OUT A DESIRABLE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM.	21



I. INTRODUCTION

Farm people throughout the United States are prepared to answer whatever calls may be made upon them in the national emergency. They feel, too, that the present emergency has elements of danger in it for agriculture, and that the Nation in general as well as farmers will be served if the interests of agriculture are protected. They do not believe that this protection need be at the expense of defense, but rather that it is an integral part of the defense effort itself. Pre-occupied with making a living, worried by an uncertain future, nevertheless farm people stand ready to contribute whatever is needed to the defense of democracy.

That feeling is reflected in this report, for it is simply a summary of the summaries of State reports that were put together at regional conferences held June 16 to June 24. The genesis of this report was a memorandum sent January 8, 1941, by Secretary Wickard to the Bureau chiefs of the Department. In that memorandum, the Secretary said that the counsel of State land use planning committees is needed in shaping the course of agriculture and the government's agricultural programs during the defense emergency. He directed the Department agencies represented on the State committees to assist in steps to that end.

In response to that call, each of the States' land use planning committees drafted a set of recommendations for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program. All were submitted to the Department prior to June 1, 1941. The State committees are composed of representatives of State and Federal Agencies and of farmers

from each type-of-farming area in their State. The State committees in turn form one of the three levels of planning committees, the others being the county committees on which farmers predominate and community committees composed wholly of farmers. The regional reports therefore may be taken as a synthesis of the knowledge of farmers and of officials concerned with agriculture. In the drafting of this report, every effort has been exerted to make it an accurate reflection of that synthesis.

The organization of the report follows generally the subject matter division used uniformly at the regional conferences. It has been thought wise to present separately in some detail the principal recommendations, under each subject matter division, that are most concerned with the immediate defense of democracy, and to group for additional consideration those recommendations that deal with post-defense needs and those that deal with problems that are pretty much a continuous concern of agriculture, in and out of emergency. A final section suggests some steps that the Department may wish to take in following up the recommendations by the State committees.

It should be emphasized that no one State or regional conference is responsible for the entire program that emerges when all of the State's recommendations are considered together. Perhaps no single State phrased its recommendations precisely in the words used in this summary. Nevertheless, the recommendations as they are presented here represent the views most generally expressed by the State planning committees of the country when the views of the committees are taken all together.

The necessity for brevity here is unfortunate. When local proposals are put together into a national report, inevitably some of the best conceived and most interesting recommendations of individual States do not appear. This report necessarily deals mainly with subjects that require action at the national level and, therefore, does not include recommendations for action at State and local levels. The committees clearly have worked hard and earnestly to point out what they believe to be the main roads agriculture must travel in the emergency. It is not possible to realize the success that attended their efforts unless at least the reports of the regional conferences are read thoroughly. The ingenuity and effort that went into the State reports has produced a reservoir of suggestive, concrete thought that will be of great value in the days ahead.

The State and Regional reports on which this national report is based are available in the Division of State and Local Planning of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

For that matter, the value of the reports already has been shown. The State committees made their recommendations at intervals of a period of five months, between February and June of this year. In a good many instances, it has proved possible for the agencies involved to put recommendations into effect at once. In considering the recommendations, too, it should be remembered that the kaleidoscopic world picture may have shifted since some proposals were drafted. The committees, however, are going right ahead, for planning is a never-ending process, and it may be expected that they will continue to hammer out ideas for action to fit the shape of the future.

II. CURRENT DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS

Special Defense Situations

Even a cursory glance at the regional summaries shows that almost every State is deeply interested in detailed integration of defense planning and agricultural planning, both for the defense effort itself and for its aftermath. This will be apparent in the recommendations that follow, in this section, which are aimed at immediate action in support of the defense program. The State committees are most interested in the planning of defense activity so that agriculture can make its full contribution to defense and at the same time avoid the mistakes that proved so costly to farmers and the Nation in earlier emergencies, particularly World War I.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Further steps should be taken to integrate the agricultural economy with the total defense effort.

Several State committees specifically called for closer coordination of planning by agricultural and defense planning groups. Many State committees urge more energetic effort to decentralize defense industries in order to push the defense effort, to spread employment, and to provide outlets for farm products. Great interest also was expressed in planning the food requirements of military camps so that local farmers may plan the marketing of their products. This planning ought to be done in cooperation with the military services, it was said. In areas where there is a large influx of defense workers, increased Federal aid for public services, including schools and roads, ought to be provided. Many agreed that relocation of farm families pushed off the land by defense actions as well as the choice of land for sites must be more carefully planned. Some urged an expanded program of fire protection as a specific defense measure. Finally, many State committees urged that defense housing ought to be planned now so that the houses may be

occupied by farm families after the emergency.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Priorities and price control policies ought to take careful account of the needs of agriculture in the interest both of the defense effort and of farmers.

If priorities are established on nitrogenous fertilizers, for instance, preference should be given to their use in production of protective foods. Requirements of agriculture for farm machinery, rubber goods, insecticides and fungicides, gasoline and oil, and other productive equipment, were cited specifically in some recommendations regarding priorities. The State committees likewise emphasized that prices of farm machinery ought not to be permitted to rise to a point where costs would be more out of line with prices received for farm products.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Additional steps for coordination of marketing and distribution of farm products were proposed.

Government purchases of food under the Lease-Lend Act and for the military establishments should be in keeping with national price policies and should be coordinated with the grading and other marketing requirements of the State Departments of Agriculture. Many of the State committees proposed the establishment of a national transportation plan for agriculture in the emergency. Several committees, especially in the Northeast, recommended that a much larger proportion of stocks of feed grains be stored in the deficit feed producing areas.

RECOMMENDATION 4: A few of the committees included recommendations regarding public finance and the general economy.

The most prominent of these proposed, on the one hand, that non-essential spending, private and public be curbed as much as possible during the emergency and recommended financing of defense costs through taxation to the fullest extent possible. On the other hand, it was recommended that industrial reorganization be considered to bring about expansion and stabilization of private employment and production.

Health and Nutrition

The reports of the State committees showed a striking unanimity in concern for the national health as part of the first line of defense. The effect of the National Nutrition Conference, of the consumer purchases

and other studies, and of reports on health of school children and men called for military service, obviously has been widespread. The recommendations, as in the case of other subjects, covered a very broad field, but it is possible to group the chief proposals into a few major recommendations. These in turn break down into those concerned with nutrition wholly or primarily and those dealing with other aspects of health. The following recommendations fall in the first category.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Development of a unified national educational program on health and nutrition is an immediate need. Hardly any other recommendation in the whole catalogue was so unanimously supported. The suggestions of individual States on methods ranged from instruction in production and preparation of foods through a school information campaign to a publicly directed effort to acquaint the Nation with the vitamin and mineral value of foods.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Another recommendation that was drafted by a majority of the committees was for changes in or expansion of Federal action programs to promote better nutrition.

Striking among the specific proposals were, first, that all school children should be served hot lunches; second, that low-income, non-relief families be included in those eligible to participate in the food-stamp plan, and that AAA payments for home food practices be increased and made more inclusive. These recommendations were made more widely than any others dealing with action to improve nutrition. In addition, there was some support for requiring relief clients to raise their own food wherever possible, and that the food-stamp plan be modified so as to include foods that are not now surplus foods, or which may be removed from the surplus list.

In addition to the recommendations that dealt wholly or primarily with nutrition there was a very large group of recommendations that dealt more generally with health problems. These likewise fell into a few broad proposals.

RECOMMENDATION 1: A major recommendation was that steps be taken to meet the need for additional doctors in rural areas. The condition has existed all along but emphasized in the emergency by the calling of doctors to military service.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Similar in character was the recommendation that a program in which Federal agencies would cooperate ought to be developed to promote the establishment of local public health services, the organization of local medical care associations for all rural people. Although this need would exist regardless of the emergency, there appeared to be a feeling that present conditions call for a beginning in this direction now. The Federal government should cooperate with State and local governments in the accelerated program to completely stamp out venereal diseases.

RECOMMENDATION 3: There was very wide belief that development of a coordinated national rural housing program should be undertaken. Here, again, the committees dealt with this as a means of meeting post-defense needs, but many felt that the emergency offers an opportunity to make great strides forward in rural housing while at the same time advancing defense work. There appeared to be a general feeling that in many areas inadequate housing constitutes one of the greatest foes of the health of farm people.

Education and Information

Three major kinds of recommendations dealing with education and information were made by most of the State committees. For one thing, the committees felt that there is an immediate, outstanding need for carrying to farm people the facts about the defense of democracy against both external and internal threats. Second was a group of recommendations for action to bring farmers facts about the changing economic situation. Third, and perhaps largest, was a group of recommendations directed to vocational training and guidance to rural youth both in and out of school and to more and general educational opportunities for them.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Nearly all the committees proposed very

substantial enlargement of existing vocational guidance and training programs for rural youth. And nearly all of them recommended that greater contributions of Federal funds be made to enlarge the programs. These programs specify training for non-agricultural pursuits.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Related to the foregoing recommendation but particularly dealing with general education was the recommendation by a number of committees that Federal grants-in-aid be authorized to give rural children equal educational opportunity with urban children. Supplementation of existing high schools with a national system of trade schools also was proposed, as was a reorientation of curricula in existing schools and colleges. All of the recommendations dealing with schooling recognized that this is far more than an immediate problem, but there appeared to be a belief that strengthening of educational processes is required as an integral part of the strengthening of democracy generally in the emergency.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Expansion of current educational efforts to assist farmer citizens to play their part in this country's democracy was a principal recommendation of many committees. In many instances, the recommendation was not accompanied by specific suggestions as to how this is to be accomplished, but there appeared to be wide agreement on the nature of the need. Familiarity with all facts concerning the war and America's defense effort was regarded as an essential, as was a full understanding of the democratic process and its differences from other political systems.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Another group of recommendations dealing with information and education was that concerned with development of a unified educational program for and through official agricultural personnel. Some of the committees saw a need for a comprehensive approach to supplying uniform information to Department and other agencies and to its transmission by official personnel to farm people. Related to this was the feeling expressed by some committees that a continuous economic information service ought to be provided by the Department to keep farmers in touch with changes in the economic outlook.

Farm Labor

Planning committees almost universally recognize a labor situation unparalleled since the last war. Most attention has been given to this subject in the States characterized by defense industries and by the production of farm products for which there is a rapidly

expanding demand. A great deal of work is being done in this field by the planning committees, especially where farm labor is scarcest. Most committees have developed ways to use present labor supplies more effectively and to recruit new labor. Many States recognize that the present situation furnishes a long awaited opportunity to give farm people without adequate job opportunities new sources of income and added security for farm people. While recognizing that unified efforts of Federal, State and local agencies and farm people probably have done more effective work on farm labor in the past six months than ever before, the committees made several important farm labor recommendations. They also reported many accomplishments already in dealing with the problems covered by the recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION 1: A national unified farm labor program, including all Federal, State and local agencies interested in labor, should be set up to inventory farm labor supplies and demand by areas or regions, to exchange such information between States and counties, and to make possible placement, movement of labor, and any other services necessary to a full utilization of farm labor where most needed, either in agriculture or industry, or to insure security and desirable working conditions for farm labor. A few States recommended the extension of the benefits of the Social Security Act and the Wages and Hours Act to Farm Labor.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Federal and State employment services should employ additional personnel familiar with agriculture in order that these services may more adequately serve agricultural needs. An educational drive should be conducted to acquaint farm operators and farm laborers with placement facilities.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Additional migratory labor camps, particularly mobile camps, were recommended, and the facilities and services they offer should be expanded materially to include housing, sanitation, child training, recreation, gardens.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Facilities and a training program should be set up to train persons to service and repair farm machinery, and persons with such abilities should be deferred from the draft.

RECOMMENDATION 5: The WPA, CCC and NYA programs should be so administered as to enable workers to help alleviate farm labor shortages without jeopardizing their status. A few of the States recommended that, in case of acute farm labor shortages at harvest, the army should furlough soldiers with farm experience, and many States proposed that labor essential to continued operation of farms be deferred from the draft.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Several States recommended the establishment through whatever channels may be appropriate, of State or county farm labor conciliation boards of committees for the purpose of hearing and conciliating of adjusting questions or disputes between farm laborers and employers. A number of States recommended that proper steps be taken to establish a fair scale of farm wages and to improve the housing and living conditions of farm labor.

Forestry

The nation's forests and woodlots are already playing a vital role in the defense effort, according to the State reports. In the great virgin forests of the Northwest and along the Pacific Coast, mills are running day and night, local operations are being extended and new areas opened. In the older forested and woodlot areas elsewhere the impact of increasing demand and rising prices is also marked.

In the regional summaries, the States express satisfaction that timber supplies are available in this time of national need, but they also express much concern over critical new problems. Fire hazards have increased everywhere. Especially critical is the situation in the West, where abnormal rainfall last winter resulted in a heavy vegetative growth that is now dry and highly inflammable. Another set of serious problems is developing as a result of the speed-up in timber harvesting and the increasing possibility for wasteful logging, cutting of second growth, clear cutting, inadequate slash disposal, and general inefficiencies in harvesting timber. Much attention is devoted by the committees to the effects of a possible relaxation of sound forestry principles, with consequent damage

to watersheds and irrigated water supplies, liquidation of employment opportunities in local areas, weakening of local tax structures, and destruction of the forest resource itself.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Harvesting of forest products for defense purposes should be carried out so as to minimize waste and assure sustained yield, so far as possible. Advantage should be taken of increased demand and more favorable prices to utilize less desirable species and lower grade material, to carry on selective cutting, and to prevent needless waste in current operations.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Immediate steps should be taken to meet increased fire hazards by comprehensive organization and preparation, involving federal, State, and local cooperation. Most States with a fire problem took the position that present machinery is inadequate to handle the emergency and urged the establishment of additional organization and, where necessary, additional legislation.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Increased attention should be given to the development and maintenance of farm woodlot. Summary reports from the Eastern half of the United States emphasized this, particularly in anticipation of possible fuel shortage and rising prices of forest products. They indicated that individual farm owners and operators should be given encouragement and assistance, and that public agencies administering credit, agricultural adjustment, and other programs, should pay special attention to provision for planning woodlot development as an integral part of individual farm planning.

RECOMMENDATION 4: There is a pressing need for information and educational work with rural people concerning fire control, the current market and price situation, and public defense needs for forest products. Attention needs to be called to the possible effects of current speed-up of cutting on possible future production.

Soil Conservation

State committees in all regions warn against forgetting the lessons of soil conservation learned during the last decade in the effort to increase production or to exploit the opportunity offered by war. They suggest new production can be obtained within the limits of soil conservation and that needed production can be obtained more certainly if good farming methods rather than exploitative methods are used.

> RECOMMENDATION 1: Many committees recommend a very much larger proportion of the ACP payments be used to induce adoption of accepted conservation practices. The Soil Conservation Service should operate wherever erosion is serious or is likely to follow war farming, regardless of whether a soil conservation district has been formed. Fertilizer supplies should be assured and if possible increased by the Government, and, if necessary, use priorities should be established. Widespread use of contour farming should be speeded in areas where needed. The grant-in-aid program should be extended to more conservation materials and practices and its use accelerated. All farm agencies should increase their efforts to induce individual farmers to adopt the soil-building practices most needed on their respective farms.

Water Utilization

The summary reports from the Western half of the United States point out that effective use of water is essential in agriculture's contribution to the defense effort. In Western irrigated and range areas the production of food and fiber for defense is dependent upon utilizing the scarce water resources. The State committees point out

that serious shortages exist in some areas, that inefficiency and losses in utilization occur, that problems of control and allocation of use rights exist, and that there are some opportunities for new water development. Most of the recommendations involve cooperation between the Department and other agencies.

> RECOMMENDATION 1: In order to meet immediate needs of the defense program for increased production of food and fiber, greater attention should be given to development of supplemental water and rehabilitation of existing irrigation projects and for small new projects, and to the development of supplies essential to improved range management. Important gains in conserving water also can be quickly made in the emergency through developing more efficient irrigation practices, better land preparation, and reduction of losses.

> RECOMMENDATION 2: In connection with future utilization of scarce water supplies, immediate attention should be given to the careful planning of new developments. Most States in the West commented upon this in one way or another. Several referred to the need for planning where there is competition as between agricultural, industrial, and power uses, especially in view of possible power shortages. Several States emphasized the urgency for planning and control of underground water development.

Range Utilization

There is a general concurrence of opinion among Western States that ranges are now stocked to a point reasonably near actual carrying capacity, and a general policy of range conservation is strongly endorsed. Concern is expressed that the pressure of good prices and current feed supplies may lead to over-stocking, over-grazing, and serious injury not only to the range, but to the production effort itself. This danger is especially great where large amounts of land still remain outside stable control.

Problems in connection with the joint utilization of range lands by game and livestock are emphasized in several of the State reports. Most of the States in the West call attention to the fact that action concerning range problems can well involve cooperation between the Department and other agencies.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Since ranges are now stocked to somewhere near their carrying capacity, further expansion of numbers should not be encouraged. All range States emphasized this point and, in general, took the position that a policy of managing ranges on a sustained yield basis should not be relaxed even during the emergency period.

RECOMMENDATION 2: All range States recommended that increased production should in general be achieved through increased unit production by improvements in livestock and in both range and livestock management practices. In order that the contribution of the range itself be as great as possible, most of the States urged that action on desirable range development work, such as water development, fencing, predatory control, and watershed protection, be speeded up. Suggestions were also made that special attention be given to the improvement of pastures on irrigated and hill areas as a means of supplementing scarce range resources, and that the feasibility of developing inaccessible and new grazing areas be examined carefully.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Immediate attention should be given to making plans for utilizing surplus feed supplies in farming areas through bringing livestock and feed together. In some instances this would involve the movement of range stock to such areas and the working out of necessary financing.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Immediate attention needs to be given to meeting increased hazards of fire in range areas, particularly those in or near forests or brushlands.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Problems of range use growing out of competition between domestic livestock and game need to be given attention. Several States suggested that studies be made of use interrelationships and a basis for a game management program be developed.

Production, Prices and Farm Management

Nearly all committees recommend modification of agricultural programs to encourage greater production of needed foods and, secondarily, of feeds for conversion into foods. Much emphasis is put on increased production of food and feed for home use, especially in non-commercial areas. Expanded production should be so guided that it may be obtained through intensification and improved farming methods in the areas best suited to such production.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Many of the State committees indicated that needed additional production should be obtained so far as possible by increasing production per animal or per acre of land cultivated rather than by developing new crop land or by establishing new farms, and thereby minimize the problem of post-war adjustment. Where increases in acreage are necessary, it is suggested that increases be encouraged on better land and that soil-conserving practices be followed so far as possible. Many States also recommended that the present need for increased food and feed be utilized in such a way as to encourage a shift from the production of export or surplus crops to diversified systems of farming in the better farming areas, and to grazing and forest types of farming in the high-hazard and submarginal areas.

RECOMMENDATION 2: It was generally suggested that increased attention should be given to farm gardens and production for farm family consumption, especially in the low-income and non-commercial farming areas. There were numerous supplementary recommendations in this general field. For example, some committees recommended that the ACP garden program be extended to all States; some recommended the development of a seed production program; and the Great Plains Region recommended that the planting of trees to protect garden sites under the Shelterbelt Program be speeded where feasible.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Several of the feed deficit States recommended action to conserve or make feed supplies more accessible to livestock farmers. The Northeast Region, especially, felt that increased storage stocks of feed grains in the region were

desirable; while a loan-storage program for roughage was suggested in the Northern Great Plains Region, and the emergency relaxation of some of the control features of the Agricultural Conservation Program was recommended by a number of States. The Southern Region recommended an increased feed production to serve as the basis for increased livestock production, chiefly for farm use or farm family consumption.

RECOMMENDATION 4: There was a large group of recommendations in every State report dealing with farm management, tenancy, land use, and the administration of the action programs of the Department. Perhaps the most important of these was the general insistence that the Department should encourage the maintenance of family-sized farms in every way possible. Improvement in tenancy arrangements which would give tenants a more secure tenure was generally recommended. Many of the State committees recommended an increase in the cooperative ownership and operation of farm machinery and other capital equipment in order to get most efficient use.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Most of the State committees said that an adjustment, loan, and marketing quota program needed to be continued and carried into the Post-Defense period. Many of the States, however, suggested specific changes or revisions of many features of the current program. Many of the State committees indicated that some form of price guarantee or support was desirable for both basic and non-basic crops, and that such guarantees or supports should be adjusted upward as prices paid by farmers move upward. Almost all of the State committees recommended the continuance and expansion of the several surplus disposal programs, especially the Stamp Plan.

Marketing and Distribution including Transportation

Planning committees feel that improvements in marketing are essential in the present and prospective defense situation. Critical conditions appear in prospect as a result of demands upon distribution and marketing systems by the army, the lend-lease program, and by metropolitan areas. Many feel that present transportation facilities will fail to meet the needs of an all-out defense program, and

that unless new planning is done and action taken now, agriculture will be hampered in its defense efforts.

RECOMMENDATION 1: A national program should be set up to conserve existing transportation facilities, to arrange for new facilities, and to make possible their most effective use.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The Department should intensify its efforts toward improvements in the marketing and distribution system for farm products essential in the defense program. State trade barriers were recognized in many States as obstacles which must be removed.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The Department's price supporting program should be placed on a flexible basis with proper regard to geographic differences and the movement of agricultural commodities into channels of consumption.

RECOMMENDATION 4: The Federal-State program of grading, inspection, collection and dissemination of market information, and terminal market establishment and supervision should be expanded and coordinated especially as it relates to defense products from farm or forest.

Pan-American Relations

The State committees recognize a need for establishing improved trade relations with other countries of the Western Hemisphere, and generally are willing to see available markets shared with those countries, provided the rest of the Nation is willing to share any burden that may be involved.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Mutual trade and cultural development within the Western Hemisphere should be fostered at an accelerated rate. Some committees recommend unrestricted trade as a means to this end, and even more committees recommend an accelerated trading program with restrictions of varying degree. Other recommendations were that trade increases be in noncompetitive products, and that trade be expanded as conditions dictate, provided agriculture bears only its fair

share of the impact. It was also proposed that a Pan-American program should be developed whereby American countries share the world demand for agricultural products produced in surplus by more than one country, that industrial development in Latin America be encouraged by the United States, and that cultural relations should be fostered through study and discussion by rural and urban groups and by school and college classes of the history culture, and current economic and social problems of the Latin-American nations.

Agricultural Finance

State land-use Planning Committees are looking to agricultural credit agencies to promote those adjustments in agriculture dictated by the needs of defense and the impacts of war. At the same time, they ask that the efforts of these agencies be directed in such a way as to avert the agricultural calamities associated with credit use during and after the last war.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Credit agencies should use their facilities to assist in obtaining the needed production of agricultural commodities essential to the success of the defense and lend-lease program, and to discourage production of those commodities for which there is now a surplus, for which the war has reduced the demand, and for which there is little prospect for improved demand soon.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Extreme care should be used in the extension of credit for a general expansion of the agricultural plant at this time. A general relaxation of credit standards should be checked now by a closely coordinated effort of all national, state and local credit agencies. However, most committees recommend that this opportunity be taken by credit agencies to convert too small uneconomic units into family size economic units. All credit and educational agencies operating in rural areas should use every means at their disposal to distribute information on the wise use of credit.

III. PLANNING FOR THE POST-WAR PERIOD

All of the State committees evidently feel that a severe strain will be placed on our entire economic system following the end of the war and the completion of the defense program, and that plans need to be developed now to carry American agriculture through that period. In general, three lines of activity are recommended:

RECOMMENDATION 1: Rural Works Program. Almost every State recommended the development of a series of projects which would supply the base for a rural works program following the defense program, and the immediate development of a sample or experimental works program.

In general, the State committees want a "non-relief" rural works program that will be adequate to care for rural unemployment and under-employment, that will carry on conservation and community projects designed to raise standards of living, and that will be administered as a rural program in such a way as not unnecessarily to interfere with needed farm labor and farm production. Types of projects most commonly suggested include a wide range of conservation works, including water facilities and forest improvement, and many of the State committees recommend that such works be carried out on both public and private land; and that they include rural and small town hospitals, community and forest roads, community centers and recreational facilities, etc. They suggest that the necessary project plans and estimates be prepared in advance and that a small-scale experimental program be started immediately in order to gain experience and develop the necessary administrative technique and organization. Many committees recommend steps to acquire control and management of forested, cut-over, and poor farming areas now as sites for utilization of surplus rural labor in the post-war period.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Curbing Uneconomic Expansion and Speculation: Almost all of the State committees indicated that situations were developing in certain areas or with respect to certain commodities that might well lead to uneconomic or speculative expansion, and that such activities should be curtailed now in order to minimize the needed adjustments in the post-defense period. Particular concern

was expressed by several States of the undesirable possibilities of runaway land values.

For example, it was suggested that so far as possible increases in production be obtained by increasing the efficiency of current numbers of livestock, acres, and machinery, and that speculative activities on marginal and high-hazard land or additional capital investments that require increased borrowings be curbed. Western ranchers were advised to maintain marketings and keep their ranges in good shape, farmers generally were advised to shift from surplus or export crops to food and feed crops and to guard against unnecessary soil exploitation. The location of short-lived defense plants in essentially rural areas was often questioned.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Shaping the Future. In one way or another all of the State committees showed strong realization that future trends are shaped by current activities, and emphatically recommended that defense efforts should, so far as possible, be used to promote desirable future changes or additions to the agricultural program.

For example, the several State committees indicate that our current farm population is adequate or more than adequate to handle the farm plant, and that continued migration from rural areas to urban employment should be encouraged. As a result, they generally recommended that farmers in low-income and marginal areas be encouraged to find urban employment, or that defense plants which might continue in operation for civilian production be located adjacent to such areas. Trade school and vocational education opportunities for rural youth need to be increased materially. Rural zoning and governmental acquisition of submarginal and forest lands should be used to prevent a backflow of unemployed into undesirable rural areas. So far as possible, the creation and maintenance of family-sized farms, rather than multi-family or subsistence farms, ought to be encouraged.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUING AND ROUNDING OUT A DESIRABLE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The several State committees necessarily considered a wide range of questions relating to all regular agricultural agencies or programs as well as questions relating to the war and the defense program. This attention was mainly based upon the feeling that action to meet the problems of war and defense could best be worked out as a part of general agricultural program, and upon the belief that an efficiently functioning agriculture is the best single contribution farmers can make to the defense effort.

In general, the State committees recognize the need for continuing the Federal agricultural programs, and offer a wide range of suggestions for expanding and revising national, state, and local action relating to agriculture and the farm population. Many of these suggestions relate to the need for a rural housing program, an enlarged land acquisition program, better guidance of settlement on new land, a more determined attack on malnutrition, increased vocational guidance and training, and the need for a really adequate conservation program. Some of these are activities which are already under way, while others call for the development of plans now to be carried out when the peace comes. Specifically, there is general agreement upon the following fields.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Vocational Education. In almost every State attention was called to the need for revising current educational procedures, especially for expanding and placing increased stress upon vocational training, which would better

fit farm youth for nonagricultural pursuits. In both vocational and general education, emphasis is placed upon a need for increased recognition of social values and upon the need for more intensive and extensive educational efforts in the field of citizenship in a democracy.

RECOMMENDATION 2. Agricultural Information. A wide range of suggestions or recommendations relating to the organization and dissemination of information were offered. In general, the State committees want to see a Federal and State system developed that will give farmers immediate information, that will operate in as simple and direct a manner as possible, and that will minimize confusion and duplication

RECOMMENDATION 3: Rural Housing and Improvement. Committees in all regions recommended some form of rural housing program sponsored by the Federal Government. In fact, a great many of the State committees feel that improved housing is an integral part, along with better nutrition and adequate medical care, of any comprehensive health program. There were also a number of related suggestions, especially from the Southern Region, for increased attention to rural sanitation, for better farm roads, and a Farm Telephone Authority was suggested in the Southeast Region.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Submarginal and High-Hazard Land. Most State committees gave a great deal of attention to submarginal, high-hazard, tax-delinquent, and publicly-owned land. In general, the recommendations in this field call for land classification of many areas, for a greatly increased program of public acquisition, for the simplification of the tax-title process in order to allow states and counties to take over tax-delinquent land, for the zoning and public management of submarginal land in order to prevent future resettlement, for increased contributions of the Federal Government to local revenues in lieu of taxes on federally-owned land, and for the development of flexible farming units with adequate feed, food, and cash reserves in such "high-hazard" areas as stay in production.

RECOMMENDATION 5: New Land Settlement. Several of the State committees gave considerable attention to the problem of new land settlement. Without exception, it was recommended that the settlement of new land is today an undertaking which ought to have intelligent guidance. Suggestions for government acquisition of new land that needs to be cleared, drained, and subdivided were included, as were suggestions for providing credit for new settlers and the shifting of allotments for special crops from areas going out of production into areas coming into farming.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Forestry and Forest Credit. All of the forest States developed comprehensive recommendations regarding forestry. A number of these States also included recommendations for more adequate forest credit. The defense program has speeded up timber cutting in almost all regions and has re-emphasized the necessity for adopting better methods of cutting and logging, fire control, insect and disease control, and the handling of forest lands in such a manner as to insure future timber supply. Almost all the states also recommended increased acquisition of forest or potential forest land by public agencies, and the development of a credit and tax program that will allow individual owners themselves to hold and develop forest land. The Southern States, especially, want to see farm forestry developed. Most States in the eastern half of the country recommend that cooperatives for the management of small timbered tracts and the sale of processing of forest products should be fostered by the Department.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Soil and Water Conservation. The State committees indicated that soil and water conservation were essential elements of any agricultural program. Further expansion of the soil conservation districts program was generally recommended, with some of the States indicating that farm planning within the district should start first on critical areas, and some suggestions were made for cooperation with farmers even though a district is not organized. The Western States thought the Water Facilities Program should be speeded up and expanded; the Eastern and Southern States gave considerable attention to drainage and recommended general strengthening and in some cases reorganization of drainage district programs; almost all the States indicated that increasing emphasis be placed on soil conservation, and that a larger proportion of funds available for the Agricultural Conservation Program should be used to this end. A substantial number of States recommended that participation in Department programs be conditioned upon the carrying out of a farm plan that would, among other things, assure conservation of the entire farm.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Range and Wildlife. Western State Committees almost all indicated that ranges are now stocked at about capacity so far as numbers of livestock and game are concerned, and they believed it desirable to try to increase the efficiency of production per head of livestock and to maintain marketings in order to maintain meat supplies and encourage range conservation. All the States felt that the range conservation activities of the Department should be

continued, and several of the Southwestern States especially recommended that the Agricultural Conservation Program be so revised as to allow the carrying out of a complete set of range practices within a single year, with payments distributed over a period of five years. The Western Committees also felt that increased attention should be given to the question of a desirable balance between wildlife and livestock.

RECOMMENDATION 9: Production Control and Adjustment. Almost all the State committees felt that the current acreage control, commodity loan, and marketing quota machinery needed to be continued even if some relaxation of control features is needed now. In general, there was considerable sentiment in favor of some form of minimum price guarantee and a number of suggestions for increasing penalties for noncooperation or intermittent cooperation. Some States indicated that they believed the certificate plan offered rather attractive possibilities, but most of the States prefer to finance the AAA and storage programs from the Federal treasury. Several States recommended that the Agricultural Conservation Program be used to induce shifts from the export or surplus crops to more diversified systems of farming through the offering of specific payments for such shifts and the determining of allotments on the basis of desirable farm management. Several States recommended that marketing quota programs should be expanded to include potatoes, apples, and vegetables.

RECOMMENDATION 10: Food Distribution. Every region recommended the continuance and expansion of the stamp plan, school lunch, and other surplus disposal programs. Several of the State committees indicated it would be desirable to work out stamp plan and school lunch devices that would allow all low-income persons, rural and urban, and all children, to obtain increased benefits and to give farmers the feeling that the program was more specifically theirs. An increased effort needs to be made to convince farmers that they derive benefit from the program. Many of the States viewed the food stamp program only incidentally as a surplus program, and primarily as a program to correct malnutrition. Many States recommended that surplus purchase programs be inaugurated at the beginning of the marketing season for crops that appeared to be in excess of current demand, and that purchase prices be based upon the need for maintaining income, rather than upon prices that might be expected to prevail without such a program. Several of the States also indicated that they were in favor of extending the number of commodities to which marketing agreements could

be applied, with the Pacific Northwest specifically recommending that marketing agreements be applicable to any commodity where it is believed they might help.

RECOMMENDATION 11: The Family-Sized Farm. Nearly all State committees discussed the desirability of encouraging the development and maintenance of the family-sized farm. Although specific recommendations as to exact size of the family-sized farm are lacking, there is clearly an increasing belief that the benefit from federal programs to large operators should be limited and that activities of the several action and credit agencies should encourage the organization and operation of such farms with sufficient resources to make possible a decent family income. Several States recommended that as a long-time policy, continuing subsidies to uneconomic or undersized units be discouraged.

RECOMMENDATION 12: Rural Rehabilitation and Supervised Credit. It is recognized by several States that the existence of a considerable number of undersized farms is likely to continue in existence despite the general desire for an increase in the number of family-sized farms, and despite recommendations for shifting low-income farmers to urban employment. As a result, the need for continuing rehabilitation, part-time employment, and other special aids, as a means of establishing farmers on a more adequate economic basis was generally recognized, and a number of suggestions were made for use of supervision in connection with the extension of credit by agencies other than the Farm Security Administration.

RECOMMENDATION 13: Marketing and Transportation. Almost all the States considered a number of questions relating to marketing and transportation, and especially in the South and West it was generally indicated that freight rates on agricultural products are discriminatory. Reductions were recommended.

Almost all of the regions considered the question of interstate trade barriers, and with the exception of some of the Southwestern States, recommended that every effort be made to eliminate existing barriers in order to allow a freer movement of interstate commerce. A number of the States asked for further developments in market grades and information, and recommendations for further development of marketing cooperatives were included. A number of State committees recommended that action be taken to reduce marketing

costs, and others recommended that action be taken to prevent further increases.

RECOMMENDATION 14: Farm Credit. Several State committees want a more flexible credit system, at least as concerns repayment. They urge that the "no man's land" between the activities of the Production Credit Association and the Farm Security Administration should be further narrowed, and that feed and seed loans should be combined with the work of the Farm Security Administration. Several States suggested that it would be desirable for a single agency to offer farmers all of the various kinds of credit now supplied by the several government agencies, with an office in each county easily accessible to the farmer, or if this is not possible, that present agencies be housed in the same building. Several of the States also recommended the development of more adequate credit facilities for small cooperatives, and, as indicated earlier, every region indicated the need for more adequate forest credit.

RECOMMENDATION 15: Tenancy and Tenant Purchase Program. Almost all the states indicated a need for improvement in tenancy arrangements, and for general expansion of the Tenant Purchase Program in order to increase ownership. All the states recognized, however, that tenancy is a continuing problem and the solution rests at least as much in the field of improving tenure arrangements as in obtaining ownership.

RECOMMENDATION 16: Foreign Trade. Immediate problems relating to the defense of the Western Hemisphere are mentioned in Part II. From a longer time viewpoint, looking to the cessation of the war, the several committees agreed that a freer movement of foreign trade and closer relations with other American countries are desirable, but that in working out details of such a policy the interests of farmers need to be recognized and that, in cases where it is felt help should be extended to foreign agricultural producers, the general public should carry the cost. All of the Southern States recommended that every effort be made to regain the foreign market for cotton. Some Western States urge that sugar-beet allotments be determined on the basis of the place of sugar beets in the farm economy, that quotas be applied to some agricultural commodities which are imported, and that the sanitary convention or other means of protecting domestic animals against foreign disease be continued.

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
★ SEP 19 1941 ★
U.S. Department of Agriculture

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C.

August 1941

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF STATE LAND USE PLANNING REPORTS TO AID IN DEFENSE AND MEET THE IMPACTS OF WAR

THE NORTHEAST REGION

Early this year Secretary Wickard requested the aid of State land use planning committees in shaping the course of agriculture and the government's agricultural programs during the defense emergency. In response to this request, each State committee drafted a set of recommendations for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program. These State reports were then summarized by regions in regional conferences held June 16 to June 24.

The major recommendations from the report for the northeast region are outlined below. The States comprising this region are Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia.

The State land use planning committees, which drafted the original reports, are composed of representatives of State and Federal agencies and of farmers from each type-of-farming area in their State. In turn the State committees are one of three levels of agricultural planning committees. The other two are community committees, composed entirely of farmers, and county committees composed of farmers and county representatives of State and Federal agencies, with farmers predominating. A list of the State committee members for the northeast region is attached.

Copies of the national report also are available.

In a regional conference at Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, land use planning committees of 12 northeastern States considered the following general subjects as related to agriculture and the national defense emergency: Health and nutrition; education and information; farm labor; forestry; soil conservation; production, prices, and farm management; marketing and distribution, including transportation; farm credit; Pan-American relations; a rural works program; Federal farm programs; and rehabilitation.

Health and Nutrition

Recognizing that underlying the efficient use of land is the health and strength of those who use it, the agricultural planning committees in the Northeast gave considerable attention to nutrition, health, and housing. An increased number of clinics in rural areas was recommended by West Virginia and Massachusetts. The extension of public health nursing facilities to every community was urged by Vermont, New York, and Massachusetts. Improvement in school health services, stricter enforcement of quarantine and sanitation laws, and a recognition of the responsibility of the public to restore draft rejectees to good health were recommended by New York and West Virginia.

To improve the diets of rural people, a program stressing the importance of home food production and storage, and instruction in nutrition for school children was recommended by New Hampshire, New York, Maryland, and West Virginia.

Improvement of housing conditions as an element in building up the health and morale essential in the period of emergency was suggested by New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, Delaware, and West Virginia. Action would be taken through increased government assistance for rural home construction and repair, expansion of consultative services on farm building construction, and the erection of housing facilities in defense areas which can be converted to farm homes after the emergency has passed.

Education and Information

To assist farm people in making sound decisions as to production, marketing, and family living in the light of continuously changing economic and social conditions, the planning committees of Delaware,

Massachusetts, Maryland, Maine, New York, and Vermont recommended that the Department of Agriculture join with the States in presenting to farmers, systematically and promptly, all available facts concerning the war, America's defense activities, and the effects of these activities upon agriculture. Delaware, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York asked that special attention be given to acquainting farm people with the issues involved in the present emergency to assist them in gaining a clearer understanding of the values of the democratic way of life, as opposed to alien systems and philosophies.

As a third point in an educational program, the planning committees of Delaware, Massachusetts, Maryland, New York, Vermont, and West Virginia called attention to present defense needs and the long-run necessity for population adjustment between agricultural and urban occupations to support their recommendation for an enlarged program of vocational guidance and placement and vocational education for young people in rural areas.

Farm Labor

One of the important adjustments which agriculture in the Northeast has had to make as a result of the current defense program concerns the increasing scarcity of available farm labor, amounting, in some areas, to a definite shortage. To cope with this situation the State land use planning committees have cooperated with a number of agencies whose activities affect the supply and demand for labor, and all of them also have made one or more specific recommendations for action. These recommendations urged that the State Employment Services continue to expand their facilities in rural areas, that they

hire additional personnel acquainted with agricultural labor requirements where needed, that they continue to facilitate the movement of surplus labor to areas of shortage by means of the interstate clearance system, that the Extension Services instruct farmers as to the use of the facilities of the Employment Services, and that surveys of farm labor demand be made as needed.

New Hampshire, West Virginia, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, and Maryland recommended that in order to provide labor for farming operations such as the harvesting of crops essential to the defense effort, the WPA suspend projects in areas of shortage. New York and Vermont asked that the WPA enforce its ruling that workers who refuse to accept private employment at prevailing farm wage rates be dropped from the WPA rolls. West Virginia and Maine recommended that WPA wages and hours be adjusted to conform to agricultural wages and hours in the community.

Encouragement to CCC enrollees to accept farm work by easing the regulations regarding re-entrance into the corps was suggested by New Hampshire and Maryland. Canvasses of possible sources of supply of seasonal workers already have been made in cooperation with the Employment Service through public and private schools, CCC and NYA; and the Selective Service Boards have agreed to defer key agricultural workers whose induction would be a serious loss to the farm, thus recognizing agriculture as an essential defense industry.

Farm operators have been encouraged to make adjustments to reduce the demand for labor such as greater use of machinery and the exchange of labor during rush periods, and to make farm work more attractive by improving the living and working conditions of their help.

Forestry

The accelerated rate of depletion of forests resulting from defense demands for lumber is causing land use planning committees to devote considerable attention to means of conserving and efficiently utilizing forest resources. Massachusetts, West Virginia, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maryland recommended that selective cutting and other good forest management practices be encouraged and enforced, particularly on private lands, through State and Federal cooperation. Increased emphasis on forestry practices was suggested for inclusion in the Agricultural Conservation Program by Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, and New Hampshire.

The organization of cooperative farm woodland associations for the management of lands and marketing of products was recommended by Maryland, Massachusetts, and New York.

As further measures in conserving forest resources, Vermont, New Hampshire, and West Virginia recommended that present public forestry programs under the Clarke-McNary and Fulmer Acts be expanded.

Soil Conservation

The committees recognized the danger that attempts to meet increased demands for food and feed may result in undue depletion of soil fertility and increased soil erosion. To prevent this, the committees recommended expanded educational programs on soil and water conservation. Maryland, New Jersey, Delaware, Massachusetts, New York, and West Virginia were among those States urging such programs. Organization of soil conservation districts as needed, and establishment

of demonstrations of good farming practices were suggested by New Jersey, Maryland, and New York.

Three States--Maryland, New York, and West Virginia--discussed the problems of drainage in their reports. Where drainage is practicable, it was suggested that poorly drained areas be drained as a means of promoting intensive use of land that is less erodible. It was recommended also that construction of farm ditches be made a conservation practice in the Agricultural Conservation Program, at least on an experimental basis, and that, in Maryland, existing tax ditch associations take advantage of the new law providing effective means for colection of assessments and maintenance of drainage ditches.

Production, Prices, and Farm Management

Increased production of dairy products, poultry products, fruits and vegetables was recommended in order to meet the increased domestic demand for these products and to make supplies available to Britain. The planning committees urged, however, that there be no unwarranted expansion of the agricultural plant. Farmers are to be encouraged to use their facilities to the limit of capacity but not to make heavy capital investments in buildings, land, and dairy cattle, it was stated. A comprehensive educational program to guide farm operators in making these adjustments was urged by Delaware and Vermont.

Connecticut and Massachusetts suggested that additional income be used to retire existing debts and put the farm plant in better condition.

The committees stated that with the intensive type of agriculture of the Northeast dependent upon an uninterrupted flow of grain and fertilizers from other areas, any "tie-up" in transportation, arising

from the defense program, would have immediate and unfortunate consequences. State planning committees of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and New York recommended, therefore, that the Federal government move some of its surplus stocks of grain into Eastern storage and that when additional storage facilities are needed some facilities be built in the Northeast. The same States, with the exception of Rhode Island and with the addition of Maine, urged that to supplement this program, farmers, dealers, and cooperatives use all existing storage facilities at their command to build up feed and fertilizer reserves of their own.

It was recognized, also, that direct defense needs may require the application of priorities on farm machinery and equipment, fertilizers, insecticides, and fungicides, rubber tires and other farm supplies. In the establishment of priorities, the committees from Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York urged adequate consideration to the needs of agriculture for these items, preferential treatment to milking machines and other labor-saving devices, and preferred consideration to the use of nitrogenous fertilizer in the production of protective foods such as milk, vegetables, and fruit.

Recognizing that the general price level has an important effect on farm returns and that maladjustment in the price structure has been a principal cause for the depressed condition of agriculture, New York and Vermont recommended that the Federal Government continue its efforts to restore farm prices to parity and to achieve stability of farm income; that full use be made, when necessary, of such measures as marketing agreements, marketing quotas, surplus removal and production control to

maintain farm prices, and that if price control becomes necessary, prices of farm products should be in line with costs before ceilings are established.

Marketing and Distribution

With regard to the marketing of farm products, it was recommended by New York, Maryland, and Massachusetts that grading and inspection facilities be expanded and used more fully, that marketing information and crop reports be continued and improved, that advantage be taken of the opportunities to sell produce at roadside markets and to military camps, and that public markets be increased in number and improved to facilitate the rapid and efficient movement of produce to consumers.

Although marketing quotas heretofore have not been in effect on any products of the Northeast, their extension to include potatoes, apples, and vegetables was recommended by New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New York. Support of the marketing agreements program was quite general. The assistance of producer organizations was recommended by New York, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Vermont in developing and adjusting agreements as needed.

The present surplus removal program was endorsed with minor modifications and improvements by most of the States. More commodities, particularly local fruits and vegetables, were recommended by Rhode Island for inclusion on the surplus list under the Stamp Plan; and direct distribution in all cities and towns was urged by Maryland, regardless of whether the Stamp Plan was in operation. Vermont and Rhode Island requested the Stamp Plan on a state-wide basis.

Farm Credit

Agricultural credit facilities for all types of credit were considered as being adequate, but the committees stated that the proper use of credit by Northeastern farmers can be materially improved. It was recommended that all agencies operating in rural areas use every means at their disposal to distribute information on the wise use of credit and to obtain further information as to the credit situation on farms.

Pan-American Relations

Closer commercial and cultural relations with Latin America were approved in general in view of the threat to the Western Hemisphere arising from the present war. It was suggested that the United States take the lead in setting up agreements for allocating existing export demand among the various exporting countries, that trade between the two continents in complementary products be greatly stimulated and that credit be extended to South America in reasonable amounts.

Rural Works Program

State land use planning committees recommended the establishment of a rural conservation works program to take up the slack in employment which is expected to result after the present emergency and to improve natural resources. The committees from West Virginia, New York, Vermont, and Maryland suggested that such a program might include projects such as schools, recreational facilities, community centers, agricultural buildings, farm-to-market and forest-to-market roads, erosion control, eradication of plant diseases, and rural housing construction and improvement.

Federal Farm Programs

The planning committees expressed general agreement as to the desirability of the Federal farm programs in stabilizing agriculture and supplies of food and products used in food production. Several modifications in particular programs were suggested, however: It was recommended by New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Vermont that the Department of Agriculture follow its policy of consulting farm groups in the development of new programs and changes in existing programs. Immediate and drastic changes in the method of determining acreage and marketing allotments should be discouraged, the New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and New York committees felt. Studies looking toward practical modifications of the present historical base plan to provide greater flexibility were suggested by New York and New Jersey.

Two committees, New Hampshire and New York, recommended that Federal aid be directed toward individual farm adjustments in accordance with a coordinated conservation plan. In addition, New Jersey, Maryland, and New York suggested that benefits accruing to a farmer for compliance with a phase of the farm program should be made contingent, within reasonable limits, upon compliance with other phases of the program. More complete unification of separate agency programs was proposed by New Jersey and New Hampshire, and state and county planning committees were suggested as a means for attaining this goal.

Rehabilitation

Plans and policies were formulated for the development of the land and the people in areas which offer inadequate opportunities in farming

because of small acreages, poor soil, and rough topography. One of these plans, advocated by New York, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, would encourage greater production of products for home consumption and supplementary sources of cash income where it seems likely that the occupants will continue to live at their present locations. New Hampshire and New Jersey recommended efforts to assist the people in these areas to take advantages of the increased opportunities for work on commercial farms and in industry, and, as the areas become vacated, to forestall the undesirable resettlement which is likely to take place after the war by such measures as State or Federal purchase and by zoning.

LATEST RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEES

*****

NORTHEAST REGION

Connecticut	New Hampshire
Delaware	New Jersey
Maine	New York
Maryland	Rhode Island
Massachusetts	Vermont
West Virginia	

June 30, 1941

STATE-LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

R. K. Clapp, Vice Director of Extension, Chairman
W. L. Slate, Vice Director of Storrs Agr. Experiment Station
A. F. Hawes, State Forester, Forestry Department
W. J. Cox, State Highway Department
Olcott F. King, Commissioner State Department of Agriculture

Farmer Members		County
Harold A. Brundage		Fairfield
Mrs. Joan N. Jones	(County Com.)	Fairfield
William E. Barton		Hartford
Samuel H. Graham		Hartford
Ralph J. Averill	(County Com.)	Litchfield
Mrs. Lena G. Pendleton	(County Com.)	Litchfield
Mrs. Lucy R. Strickland	(County Com.)	Middlesex
Julian B. Thayer	(County Com.)	Middlesex
David A. Clarke	(County Com.)	New Haven
Thomas Schreiber	(County Com.)	New Haven
Charles B. Young	(County Com.)	New Haven
Frederick W. Burton	(County Com.)	New London
Mrs. Josephone M. Peck	(County Com.)	New London
William A. Hutton		Tolland
Andrew H. Amidon	(County Com.)	Windham
Edson C. Stocking	(County Com.)	Windham

Cooperating Federal Agencies

W. J. Anderson, Public Roads Administration

USDA Representatives

W. S. Middaugh, Regional BAE Representative
Walter T. Clark, State Exec. Asst., AAA
Rodger Clapp, Ass't. to Regional Supervisor, FSA
John A. Brenneman, State Coordinator, SCS
C. Edward Behre, Forest Service
E. H. Thompson, FCA

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

George L. Schuster, Director of Extension and Experiment Sta., Chairman
W. S. Tabor, State Forester, Dover
E. S. Webb, State Game & Fish Commission, Dover
W. L. Mifflin, State Board of Agr.
Paul M. Hodgson, State Sup. Agri. Education, Dept. of Public Instruction

Farmer Members		Counties
C. A. Taylor	(County Com.)	Kent
F. Ed. Hitchens, Newark		New Castle
Frank W. Richardson, Camden	(County Com.)	Kent
Harley G. Hastings, Laurel	(County Com.)	Sussex
F. M. Gum, Jr., Frankford	(County Com.)	Sussex
Mrs. Jennie Short, Milford	(County Com.)	Sussex
Isaac Thomas	(County Com.)	Kent
Fred Wright	(County Com.)	Sussex
Mrs. H. C. Clark	(County Com.)	Kent
C. E. Jester	(County Com.)	Kent

Cooperating Federal Agency

John Herholdt, Fish & Wildlife Service

USDA Representatives

J. E. H. Lafferty, BAE Representative, Newark, Secretary
R. O. Stelzer, College Park, Md., State Exec. Officer (A.C.P.)
C. E. Ocheltree, Chairman State ACP Committee, Harrington, Del.
Richard S. Snyder, State Coordinating Officer, SCS, Newark
J. L. Soper, Representing FSA, Dover, Delaware
John Gauss, Director of Research, FCA, Baltimore, Maryland
A. R. Spillers, c/o Regional Forester, Washington, D. C.
A. G. Ingram, R. E. A.

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

Arthur L. Deering, Chairman, Director, Maine Extension Service.
Dr. Fred Griffee, Director, Maine Experiment Station, Orono
Carl R. Smith, Commissioner, Dept. of Agri., Augusta
Raymond E. Rendall, State Forest Commissioner, Augusta

Farmer Members	Counties
Hanford Crouse, Dexter	Penobscot
Frank Day, Durham	Kennebec
Fred Hagan, Houlton	Aroostook
Charles Holman, Dixfield	Oxford
F. Ardine Richardson, Strong	Franklin
William Ricker, Turner	Kennebec
Harold Shaw, Sanford	York
Harold Worthen, Bangor	Penobscot

USDA Representatives

Smith C. McIntire, BAE Representative, Secretary, Orono
William B. Oliver, State Coordinator, Orono
Homer Worcester, State Director, FSA, Bangor
F. J. Nutter, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Corinna
M. C. Peabody, Ass't. Treasurer, Federal Land Bank, Springfield, Mass.

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

R. B. Corbett, Director State Experiment Station, College Park
Thomas B. Symons, Director of Extension Service, College Park
F. S. Besley, State Department of Forestry, Baltimore
E. Lee LeCompte, State Inland Game & Fish Commission
P. E. Nystrom, State Supervisor, Crop Insurance Corp., College Park
Austin F. Shure, State Roads Commission, Baltimore
I. A. Pasarow, Maryland State Planning Commission, Baltimore

Farmer Members	(County Com.)		County
Joseph H. Blandford		Brandywine	Pr. Georges
T. Roy Brooks	"	Bel Air	Harford
W. E. Burrall	"	New Market	Frederick
Simon L. Downey		Williamsport	Washington
W. H. Holloway	"	Newark	Worcester
H. H. Nuttle	"	Denton	Caroline
D. L. Reed	"	Mt. Lake Park	Garrett
Mrs. Randall Speerlein	"	New Windsor	Carroll
P. C. Turner	"	Parkton	Baltimore
Mrs. Roy C. F. Weagly	"	Hagerstown	Washington
Willian L. Frazee	"		Allegany

Cooperating Federal Agencies

Albert C. Dunn, Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D. C.
L. C. Morley, Fish & Wildlife Service

USDA Representatives

James W. Coddington, BAE Representative, College Park
C. E. Burkhead, Agr. Mktg. Service
R. O. Stelzer, AAA, College Park
Alan C. Ebert, FSA, New Brunswick, New Jersey
Edward M. Davis, State Coordinator, SCS, College Park
E. N. Cory, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, College Park
S. H. Marsh, U. S. Forest Service, Washington, D. C.
J. K. Doughton, FCA, Baltimore

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

Willard A. Munson, Director of Extension Service, Chairman
F. J. Sievers, Director of Experiment Station
William Casey, Mass. Department of Agriculture
Miss Elizabeth Herlihy, State Planning Board
Raymond Kenney, Commissioner, Department of Conservation
R. V. Small, Supervisor Vocational Agriculture
J. C. Cort, Administrator, Milk Control Board

Farmer Members		Counties
David Crowell, Sandwich		Barnstable
Harry Cole, West Boxford		Essex
Arthur Bardwell, Hatfield		Hampshire
W. Elmer Ekblaw, Grafton		Worcester
Alden Wheeler		Middlesex
Harold Rotzel		Norfolk
Robert Leland	(County Com.)	Plymouth
Stanley Parker		Hampden
Jonathan Davis		Worcester
Arthur Tripp	"	Bristol
Roger Peck		Franklin
Mrs. Hazel Andrews, Farm Home		Worcester
Harris A. Reynolds, Forests		Middlesex
Charlie Jordan		Worcester
Walter Hopkins, Jr.		Middlesex
S. M. Richardson		Franklin
S. L. Davenport		Worcester
John Carten, Jr.		Essex
Maurice C. Bugley		Middlesex
Schaun Kelley (Acting)		Berkshire

Cooperating Federal Agencies

T. M. Keene, Bureau of Public Roads

USDA Representatives

Frederick E. Cole, BAE Representative, Amherst, Secretary
Sumner Parker, Agricultural Adjustment Administration
Roger F. Clapp, Farm Security Administration
John A. Brenneman, Soil Conservation Service
E. H. Tompson, General Agent, Farm Credit Administration
Crosby Hoar, Regional Inspector, U. S. Forest Service

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

H. B. Stevens, Acting Director of Extension, Chairman
M. G. Eastman, Director of Experiment Station
Andrew L. Felker, Commissioner of Agriculture
John H. Foster, State Forester
Frederick Clark, Planning Director, State Planning Board
Frederick A. Gardner, Public Relations Engineer, State Highway
Travis P. Burroughs, Secretary State Board of Health

Farmer Members	Counties
Joseph C. Bodwell, Sanbornton	Belknap
Clifford D. Stearns, Hinsdale	Cheshire
Clarence Marshall, Northumberland	Coos
Charles S. Foster, Lebanon	Grafton
John Reaveley, Hancock	Hillsboro
Neal J. Rice, Contoocook	Merrimack
Maurice E. Tarbell, Windham	Rockingham
George D. McDuffee, Dover	Strafford
Alfred T. Pierce, Claremont	Sullivan
A. P. Gale	Carroll
Mrs. Carl Chellis	Sullivan
Mrs. Harold Bickford	Merrimack
George M. Putnam, Concord	Merrimack
William J. Neal, Meredith	Belknap
C. H. Page	Belknap
Frank Kennett	Carroll

Cooperating Federal Agencies

H. Q. Thomas, Sr., Highway Engineer, Public Roads Administration
John Pearce, Ass't Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service

USDA Representatives

Harry C. Woodworth, BAE Representative, Secretary
J. R. Graham, Chairman of State Committee of the AAA
Brandon Wright, Acting State Coordinator, SCS
Roger F. Clapp, ASS't. to Regional Supervisor, FSA
C. L. Graham, Supervisor, White Mountain National Forest
A. L. Gillett, Farm Credit Administration

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

NEW JERSEY

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

L. A. Bevan, Director, Extension Service, Chairman, New Brunswick
Dr. Wm. H. Martin, Director, Agricultural Experiment Station
C. P. Wilber, State Forester and Director, State Dep't. of Conservation and Development, Trenton
Russell VanNest Black, Consultant-Director, N. J. State Planning Board, Trenton
Wm. C. Lynn, Administrative Ass't., State Dep't. of Agriculture, Trenton

Farmer Members		County
Kenneth S. Roberts, R.D.1, Bridgeton		Cumberland
James D. Holman, Whitesville	(County Com.)	Ocean
Mrs. Carl Liepe, Cologne	" "	Atlantic
Louis J. Sanguinetti, Minotola	" "	Atlantic
Ernest B. Phillips, Jobstown	" "	Burlington
Wendell Beideman, Haddonfield	" "	Camden
Allen McClain, Green Creek		Cape May
Jack Thornborrow, R.D. 2, Milville		Cumberland
Mrs. W. P. Roop, Woodbury	" "	Gloucester
Ralph Starkey, Mullica Hill	" "	Gloucester
Clifford Snyder, Pittstown		Hunterdon
Mrs. Maurice Croshaw, R.D.1.,Hightstown		Mercer
Herbert W. Voorhess, R.D., Skillman		Mercer
Mrs. H. Courtney Brown, R.D.1, Jamesburg		Middlesex
Lawrence J. Smith, P.O.Box 222, South River		Middlesex
C. Richard Applegate, Freehold	" "	Monmouth
Elbert Van Duyne, Towaco		Morris
Miss E. Oakley		Monmouth
Daniel McE. Crabbe, Toms River	" "	Ocean
Frank C. Pettit, Woodstown		Salem
Mrs. C. J. MacLachlan, R.D.3, Plainfield		Somerset
Van N. Voorhees, R.D.2, Bound Brook		Somerset
Mrs. Floyd Buss, R.D. Sussex		Sussex
Carl Schneider, R.D. Port Jervis, N.Y.		Sussex
Howard Hamlen, Phillipsburg		Warren

Cooperating Federal Agencies

J. E. Mincher, Sr. Highway Engr., U. S. Bureau of Public Roads, Trenton

USDA Representatives

Herman I. Miller, State BAE Representative, Secretary, New Brunswick
Alan C. Ebert, Assistant to Regional Supervisor, FSA, New Brunswick
Linwood L. Lee, State Coordinator, SCS, New Brunswick
A. R. Spillers, Forester, Region 7, U. S. Forest Service, Washington, D. C.
A. Hulse Mooney, Farm Credit Administration, Somerville
J. L. McLaren, District Supervisor, Surplus Marketing Admn., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. A. Collins, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Morristown

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

NEW YORK

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

L. R. Simons, Director of Extension, Chairman, Ithaca
M. P. Catherwood, Commissioner, N. Y. State Division of Commerce
W. S. Dunn, Ass't. Commissioner, State Dep't. of Agri. & Markets, Albany
A. K. Getman, Chief, Bur. of Agri. Education, Albany
C. E. F. Guterman, Ass't. Director, Cornell Agri. Exp. Station, Ithaca
W. G. Howard, State Forester, Conservation Department, Albany
S. N. Spring, Dean, College of Forestry, Syracuse U., Syracuse
William Robinson, Dept. of Public Works, Syracuse
L. B. Skoffington, Agricultural Editor, "Democrat & Chronicle", Rochester
Otis Thompson, Key Banker, N. Y. State Bankers' Assoc., Norwich
E. S. Foster, State Conference Board of Farm Organizations

Farmer Members		Counties
J. Leon Atwood, Plattsburg		Clinton
Robert V. Call, Batavia		Genesee
Lee Chamberlain, Wyoming		Wyoming
Mrs. Grace L. Clark, North Norwich	(County Com.)	Chenango
Lisle Cottrell, Homer	(County Com.)	Cortland
Harold J. Evans, Georgetown	(County Com.)	Madison
Louis A. Fisher, Spencer	(County Com.)	Tioga
Murray J. Fisher, Madrid	(County Com.)	St. Lawrence
Homer H. Jones, Homer		Cortland
Herbert P. King, Trumansburg	(County Com.)	Seneca
Ralph B. Kohl, Newburgh		Orange
T. E. LaMont, Albion	(County Com.)	Orleans
Thomas F. Luther, Jr., Saratoga		Saratoga
Charlotte Luce		Tompkins
Miss Elizabeth MacDonald, Delhi		Delaware
H. G. Marquart, Orchard Park		Erie
H. L. Peet, Pike	(County Com.)	Wyoming
Roy Porter, Elba		Genesee
H. M. Stanley, Skaneateles		Onondaga
Wm. Storie, Bovina Center		Delaware
Mrs. E. P. Wagenblass, Warsaw	(County Com.)	Wyoming
Clayton G. White, Stow	(County Com.)	Chautauqua
John Wickham, Cutchogue		Suffolk
E. B. Clark	(County Com.)	Chenango
W. W. Hawley		Genesse
B. P. Jones		Ontario
W. J. Rich		Washington
Carl G. Wooster, Union Hill		Wayne
F. M. Smith		Otsego
E. C. Strobeck		Wayne
G. A. Turner	(County Com.)	Chemung
Mrs. D. J. Wickham		Suffolk

Cooperating Federal Agencies

J. H. Ayres, Senior Highway Engineer, Public Roads Administration, Albany

USDA Representatives

G. B. Robinson, BAE Representative, Secretary, Ithaca
E. A. Flansburgh, AAA, Ithaca
C. R. Lockard, Forest Economist Northeastern Forest Exp. Station, Cooperstown
I. V. Stafford, SCS, Ithaca
R. T. Space, State Director, FSA, Ithaca
E. R. Eastman, Federal Land Bank, Springfield, Mass.

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

H. O. Stuart, R. I. Agricultural Ext. Service, Acting Dir., Chairman
J. Cirwein, Department of Public Works, Landscape Engineer
A. J. Webster, State Planning Board, Director of State Planning
F. S. Madison, Rhode Island Agricultural Conference, Representative
E. L. Austin, Department of Education, Teacher Trainer
R. G. Bressler, Department of Agriculture and Conservation
Sara E. Coyne, Agriculture Ext. Service

Farmer Members		County
H. H. Barton, West Warwick		Kent
Peter C. Peterson, Johnston		Providence
W. G. Dyer, Portsmouth		Newport
George B. Crandall, Wyoming		Washington
David P. Reid, Wallum Lake		Providence
William Richards, Newport		Newport
E. Ward Mason, Warren		Bristol
Harry Peckham, Newport		Newport
Richard H. Gee, Fiskeville		Kent
Rodney Cruden		Kent
William Edwards		Washington
Colin Brown	(County Com.)	Washington
O. D. Murphy	(County Com.)	Washington
John Barden	(County Com.)	Providence
Mortin Phetteplace	(County Com.)	Providence

Cooperating Federal Agencies

H. J. McKinney, Public Roads Administration, Senior Highway Engineer

USDA Representatives

B. E. Gilbert, State BAE Representative, Secretary
R. S. Shaw, AAA, State Executive Officer ACP
J. A. Brenneman, SCS, State Coordinator
G. K. Tinkham, FCA, District Supervisor
C. E. Behre, Forest Service, Director Northeastern Forest Exp. Station
R. F. Clapp, FSA, Assistant Regional Supervisor

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

J. E. Carrigan, Extension Service, Chairman, Burlington
J. L. Hills, Experiment Station, Burlington
E. H. Jones, State Dept. of Agriculture, Montpelier
P. H. Merrill, State Forest Service, Montpelier
George Davis, State Fish & Game Commissioner, Montpelier
H. E. Sargent, State Highway Dept., Montpelier
F. W. Shepardson, State Planning Board,
Howard Martin, Vocational Agriculture, Burlington

Farmer Members		Counties
T. F. McCauley, Shoreham	(County Com.)	Addison
R. E. Tinkham, No. Bennington	(County Com.)	Bennington
Paul K. Morrison, Barnet	(County Com.)	Caledonia
E. Wright Fay, Jericho	(County Com.)	Chittenden
John Willson, Lunenburg	(County Com.)	Essex
Earl Drew, Richford	(County Com.)	Franklin
Ross Pearl, Grand Isle	(County Com.)	Grand Isle
Ray Barrows, Johnson	(County Com.)	Lamoille
Edson E. Gifford, E. Bethel	(County Com.)	Orange
C. M. Borland, Glover	(County Com.)	Orleans
Cecil Dodge, Pawlet	(County Com.)	Rutland
M. H. Lyndes, Plainfield	(County Com.)	Washington
George H. Bailey, Rochester	(County Com.)	Windsor
Burton Ward, Moretown	(County Com.)	Washington
William Anderson, Shoreham	(County Com.)	Addison
Mrs. C. C. Fitzgerald, Winooski	(County Com.)	Chittenden
Mrs. Harold Caron, Orleans	(County Com.)	Orleans
Mrs. Norman Collins, Pittsford	(County Com.)	Rutland
Mrs. Miles Nelson, Woodstock	(County Com.)	Windsor
M. Miller		Putney, Vt. R.D.

Cooperating Federal Agencies

A. M. Snow, Public Roads Administration, Montpelier
George Lay, Fish and Wildlife Service, Boston, Mass.

USDA Representatives

H. R. Varney, BAE Representative, Secretary, Burlington
W. F. Sinclair, AAA, Johnson
Otto C. Koenig, F. A., Rutland

(Continued)

VERMONT (cont'd.)

USDA Representatives (cont'd.)

Brandon Wright, SCS, Burlington
Leslie Gallup, Acting State Director, FSA, Burlington
James P. Sprague, FCA, Montpelier

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

WEST VIRGINIA

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

J. O. Knapp, Director, W. Va. Agri. Extension Service, Chairman, Morgantown
C. R. Orton, Dean, W. Va. U. College of Agriculture, Director Agri. Exp. Station, Morgantown
T. D. Gray, State Conservation Commission, Charleston
P. H. Price, State Geologist, W. Va. Geological Survey, Morgantown
E. L. Bailey, Commissioner, State Road Commission, Charleston
John M. Lowe, State Supervisor, Vocational Agriculture

Farmer Members		Counties
Clyde Bonar, Burlington		Mineral
J. D. Anderson, Morgantown		Monongalia
Milton Dolly, Onego		Pendleton
John M. Bailey, Athens		Mercer
Strather M. Lohr, Kasson	(County Com.)	Barbour
Burns Kittle, Cameron	(County Com.)	Marshall
F. W. Ruckman, Millpoint	(County Com.)	Pocahontas
Hayward Barnard, Harrisville	(County Com.)	Ritchie
E. L. Nutter, Parkersburg	(County Com.)	Wood
B. B. Scheibelhood, Huntington		Wayne
E. L. Henshaw, Martinsburg	(County Com.)	Berkeley
Mrs. R. E. Stump, Buckhannon	(County Com.)	Upshur
Miss M. Thatcher, Martinsburg	(County Com.)	Berkeley
C. M. Bailey, Cox Mills		Mercer
G. C. Hoy, Tornado		Kanawha
A. W. Randolph, Lost Creek	(County Com.)	Harrison

Cooperating Federal Agencies

William Brewster, Public Roads Administration, Charleston

USDA Representatives

J. F. Ferry, BAE Representative Secretary, Morgantown
E. S. Vandervert, State Chairman Agricultural Conservation Program, Morgantown
R. G. Ellyson, State Director, FSA, Morgantwon
L. L. Lough, State Coordinator, Soil Conservation Service, Morgantown
A. A. Wood, Supervisor, Monongahela Natl. Forest, FS, Elkins, Forest Supervisor
J. K. Doughton, General Agent, FCA, Baltimore

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

W. S. Middaugh, U. S. Dep't. of Agriculture, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
★ SEP 19 1941 ★
U.S. Department of Agriculture

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C.

August 1941

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF STATE LAND USE PLANNING REPORTS TO AID IN DEFENSE AND MEET THE IMPACTS OF WAR

THE SOUTHEAST REGION

Early this year Secretary Wickard requested the aid of State land use planning committees in shaping the course of agriculture and the government's agricultural programs during the defense emergency. In response to this request, each State committee drafted a set of recommendations for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program. These State reports were then summarized by regions in regional conferences held June 16 to June 24.

The major recommendations from the report for the southeast region are outlined below. The States comprising this region are Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.

The State land use planning committees, which drafted the original reports, are composed of representatives of State and Federal agencies and of farmers from each type-of-farming area in their State. In turn the State committees are one of three levels of agricultural planning committees. The other two are community committees, composed entirely of farmers, and county committees composed of farmers and county representatives of State and Federal agencies, with farmers predominating. A list of the State committee members for the southeast region is attached.

Copies of the national report also are available.

Recommendations by the State committees of the Southeast at a recent regional meeting at Asheville, North Carolina, dealt with the following general subjects as related to agriculture and the defense emergency: Special defense situations; health and nutrition; education and information; farm labor; forestry; soil conservation; production, prices, and farm management; marketing and distribution, including transportation; Pan-American relations; agricultural finance; a rural works program; tenant purchase program; rural housing and improvement; and farm credit.

Special Defense Situations

The State land use planning committees from Alabama, Florida, and Virginia suggested that defense houses in rural areas be built on land leased from farmers, with provision for purchase by the landowners when no longer needed for defense. Alabama, Kentucky, and Virginia recommended that in the location of new military establishments and defense industries, consideration be given to the location of these activities upon land unsuited for agriculture, to decentralization of industry, the permanent integration of new industries into the local economy of the region, the availability of surplus labor, and the need of an outlet or market for local agricultural products. The need for more definite provisions to assist farm families displaced by defense projects to become satisfactorily relocated was emphasized.

All States suggested that consumption of locally produced agricultural products be expanded to meet the needs of defense areas, that the shortage of fluid milk for defense areas be met in part by shifting present production of milk now used for manufacturing processes to defense areas, and that attention be given the possibility of expanding consumption of foods under the nutritional program.

The committees also all recommended that investigations be made to determine the situation with regard to the supply of commercial fertilizers and insecticides and that plans be developed for assuring adequate supplies of these commodities at reasonable prices.

Florida and North Carolina proposed that local areas be relieved of the major burden of costs of roads, schools, recreation and sanitation facilities needed for defense projects.

Health and Nutrition

State committees in the southeastern region devoted considerable attention to problems of health and nutrition. All States recommended that county health units be established in every county in the region, that programs be instituted for eradication of venereal disease, and that public health departments supply farm families with advice and technical assistance on the construction of sanitary facilities.

Sanitation and health should be more vigorously promoted through groups and associations designed to assist individuals, it was stated. Federal surveys of the physical status of school children were proposed. It was suggested that community groups and organizations wage an intensive nutrition and health program.

Other recommendations made by all States dealing with the conservation of human resources included encouragement to farm families to raise as much as possible of the food they consume, the making of landlord-tenant agreements providing that the tenant grow sufficient food and feed, and provisions in all farm plans for the production of food and feed best suited to the type of soil. It was urged by all States that county agricultural planning committees make specific recommendations concerning food and feed production in given areas, besides taking the initiative in establishing nutrition subcommittees to improve farm family living through better nutrition.

The general opinion of the planning committees was that families receiving public assistance be required to produce and conserve all food possible, and that the FSA provide funds to those farm families below the economic level of the present standard loan client, in order that they might increase their production of food. The committees also felt that nutrition and health education programs should be expanded and intensified. It was urged that the teaching of the essentials of food selection and nutrition in the classroom be extended, and that clubs and other organizations be used for this purpose.

The inauguration or expansion of county health inspection and treatment services was recommended by Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia, as well as the investigation of existing forms of cooperative medical care.

The construction of hospitals in rural centers as a part of any rural works program initiated by the Federal government, was recommended. It was urged, also, that State and county governments and other agencies support measures designed to improve rural recreational facilities.

Education and Information

Dealing with rural education, it was proposed that ways and means be rapidly devised and quickly acted upon for generating an irrevocable conviction in the minds of all the people that the war must be won; that measures necessary for the successful prosecution of the war must have priority over all other interests. To this end

the people must be given unshakable assurance that they have a vital stake in the preservation of our system of government, it was stated.

The proposal was made that appropriate personnel and facilities be set up in Washington and in each State to develop methods and procedures to make certain that all citizens understand and appreciate the defense program as related to agriculture.

General occupational training to be made available to all rural boys in high school was recommended by all States. It was suggested also that vocational guidance be made available to rural boys and girls in high school, and that full use be made of community resources for training in occupations represented in the community. It was proposed that special training courses for industry essential to national defense be continued and expanded for all rural youth.

Another proposal was that part-time and evening classes in occupations and occupational training be made available in industrial centers for unskilled men and women who formerly lived on farms; and that training in vocational agriculture and home economics be provided for all rural boys and girls in high school, with part-time and evening classes for youth and adults desiring such training.

Farm Labor

Recommendations dealing with farm labor and rural welfare included the proposal that the benefits of the Social Security Act and Wages and Hours Act be extended to farm laborers. It was proposed that county agricultural planning committees establish farm labor subcommittees wherever a deficit or surplus of farm labor occurs, to make

farm labor studies, and to work with the State employment services in meeting farm labor needs.

Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Tennessee recommended that State works projects administrations, through their representation on county planning committees and county professional workers councils, advise farmers of the procedure for obtaining the release of farm laborers on WPA rolls; and that these administrations report currently on the movement of farm laborers from farms to WPA projects and from WPA projects to farms.

Another recommendation was that the State employment services and other agencies give paramount consideration to the placement of farm workers in defense industries and needed production, to the training of farm workers for available jobs, and the development of attitudes of individual responsibility. Another was that the United States Employment Service in its cooperation with the State employment services make adequate provision for farm placement services.

With regard to non-farm employment for rural people, it was recommended that the county agricultural planning committees and county offices of the State employment services encourage the location of small industries in rural areas having a surplus of farm labor. It was proposed also that county agricultural planning committees give consideration to the feasibility of organizing cooperative processing and marketing facilities so as to provide employment for surplus farm labor.

Forestry

Dealing with forestry and wildlife, it was proposed by Florida, Georgia, and Virginia that county agricultural planning committees be encouraged to establish county forestry subcommittees with at least one technical forester from some public agency on the committee to assist woodland owners in forestry guidance, and that woodland owners be encouraged to use written agreements in the sale of forest products.

It was recommended that farmers be encouraged to develop farm fish ponds, and to provide for wildlife by encouraging the growth of food and cover producing trees, shrubs, and plants in woodlands, fields, borders, and rough lands; and that forest land taxes be adjusted on the basis of equitable valuation. Payments for the conservation of woodlands, in addition to the present soil building allowed for each farm, were proposed by Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Adequate provision for statewide protection of forests against fire was recommended by Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia, and it was urged that Federal assistance be provided for cooperative protection against forest diseases and insects on private and publicly owned lands.

Establishment of a woodland base for each farm under the AAA with funds provided to make benefit payments was recommended. Extension of the Clark-McNary Act to provide for cooperation with the State and private landowners in growing, marketing, and utilizing forest products was recommended.

Proposals made by Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia were that Federal, State, and county governments acquire forest lands which are unsuited to private ownership, that an increase be made in the funds for work specified in the Norris-Doxey Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, and that the Clark-McNary Act be modified so as to permit the distribution of forest seedlings to non-farm timber owners.

Encouragement and aid were recommended for farm forestry cooperatives, as well as the expansion of forestry research to develop desirable leasing arrangements for proper woodland management, and taxation. Continuation and expansion of the southern forest survey were urged. A modification of the lending policy of the Farm Credit Administration was proposed to provide credit better adapted to the long-time nature of the woodland crop; as well as to encourage desirable shifts in agricultural production.

Soil Conservation

All States recommended that farmers continue such soil conservation practices as cover crops, contour conservation, strip cropping, and terracing, and that they utilize all fertilizer materials produced or available on farms; also that farmers increase the use of phosphates and lime as an essential to the adequate maintenance of soil fertility and maximum production.

Alabama and Virginia urged that adequate facilities be maintained for the production and distribution of fertilizer materials, and that priorities be established where and when necessary. Investigations

were recommended to determine the extent to which fertilizer plants are being diverted to defense production, so that plans may be developed to insure adequate facilities for the production and distribution of fertilizer materials.

The Regional conference recommended that State and county agricultural planning committees designate areas unsuited to agriculture, including areas suited for hydro-electric and flood control reservoirs; that adequate research be provided for the study of drainage areas to determine a sound basis for taxation, production possibilities, and the feasibility of reclamation; also, that the water facilities program for livestock be extended to the Southeast.

The conference urged that the authorization of future drainage districts be permitted only upon the advice and control of Federal and State agencies, and that soil conservation districts emphasize and facilitate the development of individual farm plans in critical areas rather than on the basis of priority of applications.

Production, Prices, and Farm Management

In a 12-point program of agricultural adjustment in the Southeast, the planning committees pointed to the increased demand for food products in this country and for export to Britain. Accordingly, they indicated the need for increased production of dairy products, beef and hogs, eggs and poultry to help satisfy these demands. Such a program in the Southeast, it was stated, would also tend toward a better balancing of the agriculture in this region.

It was suggested that increased feed production should precede increases in livestock numbers, such increases to include small grains, lespedeza, grain surghums, perennial hays, silage, pasturage, and field crops for grazing. Better breeding, feeding, and livestock management practices were advocated. The committees recommended that financial aid be given farmers desiring to improve pastures and develop livestock on the basis of carefully worked out plans for individual farms.

The committees urged that greater emphasis be given the production of food for home use, that every acre on the farm be utilized according to use capability so as to obtain maximum income, and that all agricultural agencies cooperate in developing individual farm and home plans in line with desirable production adjustments.

It was urged that the Department of Agriculture make adequate provision for the acquisition and joint use of farm equipment by farmers, in view of the prospective shortage of such equipment.

Marketing and Distribution

The Regional conference recommended that farm people be encouraged and assisted in organizing and operating cooperative marketing and purchasing associations, in developing cooperative marketing and management associations for forestry, in establishing and operating cooperative service organizations for low-income farmers, and by using cooperative purchasing organizations to permit volume buying at reduced prices.

It was recommended that Federal and State grading services be extended to all farm products, and that Federal and State inspection services be extended to include all local packing and processing plants.

Attention was directed to interstate trade barriers. It was recommended that Federal and State agencies cooperate in establishing uniform rules, laws, and other trade and marketing practices to facilitate interstate trade in both farm and non-farm products, that such regulations apply equally to rail and truck transportation, and that the discrimination in freight rates under the present system of territorial division of the nation be eliminated.

It was urged that the State Experiment Stations and other research agencies do more research on marketing problems, such as may arise from defense activities or which are likely to occur as a result of post-war conditions; and that wider and more intelligent use of marketing information be encouraged.

It was recommended that marketing facilities such as common and cold storage conveniences, quick freezing units, canneries, creameries, dressing and packing plants, and other facilities for processing and preserving farm products be improved and expanded; also that all areas adapted to a permanent agriculture be provided with adequate highway service.

Pan-American Relations

Regarding foreign markets a recommendation was made that trade relations with Central and South American countries and Canada should

be improved, that our tariff policy should be modified and new trade agreements negotiated to enable foreign buyers to purchase American farm products, and that more attention be given the production of commodities wanted by foreign countries.

Agricultural Finance

Recommendations dealing with agricultural credit and farm finance included proposals that county agricultural planning committees give more consideration to the credit needs of farmers; also, that these committees devise ways and means of making the services of the Farm Credit Administration and the Farm Security Administration more readily available to farmers. The caution was sounded, however, against the overextension of debt which may have to be met during a post-war period of uncertain economic opportunity.

It was recommended that the planning committees give further consideration to the usefulness of various types of cooperatives, such as credit unions, in promoting the welfare of farm people, and that farmers avail themselves of the benefits to be derived from the cooperative purchase of supplies needed in farm adjustment operations and cooperative marketing. Another recommendation was that the Federal Credit system promote the owner-operated family-size farm, facilitate adjustments in production, and establish a balanced and more diversified agriculture; and that commercial lending institutions also shape their policies to these ends.

Rural Works Program

Considering proposals for a rural works program, it was recommended that national legislation be enacted authorizing public employment of farm people on privately-owned land; also, that consideration be given the establishment of a rural works program to be initiated after the close of the war, and that such a program be outlined in advance of the need for it and tried out on an experimental basis.

Tenancy and Tenant Purchase Program

Expansion of the tenant purchase program of the Farm Security Administration was recommended to increase the percentage of farm ownership in the Southeast. It was suggested, also, that this program be broadened to include young men having agricultural training or experience, and that it be adjusted to permit owners of small uneconomic farms to borrow funds for the purchase of additional land to enlarge their farms to family-size units.

Dealing with land tenure, the Regional conference recommended that State and county land tenure subcommittees be organized for the purpose of making tenure more secure by means of written leases as a part of the farm and home plan, the use of automatically renewable written leases subject to cancellation not less than six months before expiration dates, and the use of leases providing for a certain amount of compensation for the termination of tenure without cause.

Rural Housing and Improvement

An adequate rural housing program by the Federal Government, to be coordinated by county agricultural planning committees through local housing authorizities, was proposed by Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Caroline, and Virginia. Individuals, it was stated, should be encouraged to improve and maintain adequate housing facilities. It was recommended that houses constructed for defense purposes be located in both rural and urban areas, with consideration given to utilization after the emergency.

Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia recommended that county and community agricultural planning committees give attention to obtaining adequate financial support for the construction and maintenance of farm-to-market roads; that local effort be directed toward the extension of private and public distribution lines and services; and that adequate buildings and equipment be provided for rural schools.

South Carolina and Virginia urged that a more equitable system of taxation be recommended to the State legislatures, and that the collection of delinquent taxes be handled entirely through State revenue agencies.

Farm Credit

Proposals were made that the Farm Credit Administration develop a procedure for giving farm management supervision to borrowers who receive production adjustment loans, and that the Federal government

consider the feasibility of modifying the Farm Credit Act so as to make possible the administration of all services of the Farm Credit Administration through one office in each county.

Other recommendations were that the production credit associations broaden their lending activities to service a much larger number of farmers in need of such credit, and that these associations give adequate consideration to the needs of farmers whose annual production credit borrowings may be less than $200. It was urged that the Federal government consider the consolidation into one agency of all Federal credit services to farmers whose security is not sufficient to support PCA loans and commercial credit loans, and that the credit needs of such farmers be met with adequate appropriations.

LATEST RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEES

*** ***

SOUTHEAST REGION

Alabama	North Carolina
Florida	South Carolina
Georgia	Tennessee
Kentucky	Virginia

June 30, 1941

STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

P. O. Davis, Chairman, Director of Extension, Auburn
M. J. Funchess, State Director Experiment Station, Auburn
R. E. Cammack, State Supervisor, Voc. Agriculture, Montgomery
C. J. Sherlock, President State Highway Commission, Montgomery
Brooks Toler, Forester, State Conservation Dept., Montgomery
A. M. Pearson, Ala. Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Auburn
A. J. Hawkins, Director, State Planning Commission, Montgomery

Farmer Members		County
J. R. Brunson		Butler
W. H. Farrington	(County Com.)	Chambers
Jackson N. Granade	(County Com.)	Washington
Judge Allen Grubbs		Sumter
Blois (G.B.) Hill	(County Com.)	Talladega
Mrs. W. J. Lambard		Clarke
Gust Riemer	(County Com.)	Baldwin
Mrs. Don Robertson		Lee
N. S. Stewart	(County Com.)	Blount
Owen J. Whitlock		Colbert
Mrs. John W. Seibold		Marshall
W. L. Randolph		Montgomery
Mrs. C. M. Murphy		Henry

Cooperating Federal Agencies

C. D. Snead, District Engineer, Bur. Public Roads, Montgomery

USDA Representatives

Foy Helms, Secretary, BAE Representative, Auburn
A. W. Jones, Administrative Officer in Charge, AAA, Auburn
O. C. Medlock, State Coordinator, SCS, Auburn
M. H. Pearson, State Director, FSA, Auburn
Frank Rasor, State Supervisor, U. S. Forest Service, Montgomery
J. B. Hearin, Farm Credit Administration, New Orleans, La.

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

William A. Hartman, 249 Peachtree Street, N. E., Atlanta, Georgia

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

Wilmon Newell, Director of Agricultural Extension, Chairman, Gainesville
Harold Mowry, Asst. Director Research, Agricultural Experiment Station, Gainesville
Mary E. Keown, State Home Demonstration Agent, Tallahassee
H. H. Hume, Dean, College of Agriculture, Gainesville
J. Franklin Williams, State Director, Vocational Agriculture, Tallahassee
Arthur C. Brown, Asst. Plant Commissioner & Quarantine Inspector, State Plant Board, Gainesville
H. J. Malsberger, State Forester, Florida Forest & Park Service, Tallahassee
J. H. Dowling, State Highway Engineer, Tallahassee
Nathan Mayo, State Commissioner of Agriculture, Tallahassee
George G. Gross, Executive Secretary, State Planning Board, Tallahassee
I. N. Kennedy, Executive Secretary, State Game & Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee
J. V. Knapp, State Veterinarian, Florida State Livestock Sanitary Board, Tallahassee
Jean Henderson, State Board of Health, Jacksonville
A. P. Spencer, Vice-Director, Extension Service, Gainesville

Farmer Members		County
Mrs. G. J. Barstow	(County Com.)	Palm Beach
Mrs. Amos Davis		Gadsden
Mrs. Fred Forward	(County Com.)	Seminole
Leo Mathis	(County Com.)	Walton
Landis Blitch		Marion
J. E. Boardsley	(County Com.)	Hendry
W. T. Watkins	(County Com.)	Hillsboro
T. J. Durrance		Highlands
J. V. Hodnett		Polk
H. E. Maltby		St. Johns

Cooperating Federal Agencies

H. J. Morrison, Senior Highway Engineer, P.R.A., Tallahassee
W. A. Gresh, Regional Inspector, Fish & Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Ga.
Eleanor Herring, Acting State Director, Office of Gov't. Reports, Jacksonville
Charles W. Kenyon, R.E.A.
G. P. Shingler, Senior Chemist in Charge, Naval Stores Station, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, Olustee

USDA Representatives

J. R. Greenman, State RAE Representative, Secretary, Gainesville
H. G. Clayton, State Administrator, AAA, Gainesville
J. A. Texada, Jr., State Administrator, FSA, Gainesville
D. C. Gunn, State Coordinator, SCS, Gainesville
Frank A. Albert, Forest Supervisor, Forest Service, Tallahassee
T. A. Liefeld, In Charge Lake City Branch, Southern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, Lake City
Harry L. Brown, District Agent, FCA, Columbia, S. C.

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

W. S. Brown, Chairman, Director of Agricultural Extension Service, Athens
H. P. Stuckey, Director of Expt. Station, Experiment, Georgia
Paul W. Chapman, Dean of College of Agriculture, Athens
L. M. Sheffer, State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture
S. H. Starr, Director of Coastal Plain Exp. Station, Tifton, Georgia
H. T. McIntosh, Chairman of State Planning Board, Albany, Georgia
T. F. Abercrombie, Director of State Dept. of Health, Atlanta
F. C. Ward, Secretary of State Soil Conservation Committee

Farmer Members		County
S. E. Statham, Cobb		Sumter
William F. Boggan, Hahira	(County Com.)	Lowndes
W. H. Smith, Statesboro	(County Com.)	Bulloch
H. L. Fulford, Wrightsville		Johnson
A. G. Cremer, La Fayette	(County Com.)	Walker
M. M. Norman, Hartwell		Hart
Clark Palmer, Loganville	(County Com.)	Gwinnett
D. B. Taylor, Greensboro	(County Com.)	Greene
Robert Stembridge, Ella Gap		Gilmer
W. H. Norris, Zebulon		Pike

Cooperating Federal Agencies

Roy Moore, Assistant Regional Director, Fish & Wildlife Service

USDA Representatives

Oscar Steanson, Secretary, BAE, Athens
T. R. Breedlove, AAA State Administrative Officer in Charge, Athens
E. C. Young, FSA, State Director, Athens
T. L. Asbury, SCS, State Coordinator, Athens
W. R. Hine, Senior Forester, U. S. Forest Service, Atlanta
H. S. Johnson, FCA, Director of Information, Columbia, S. C.

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

William A. Hartman, 249 Peachtree Street, N. E., Atlanta, Georgia

KENTUCKY

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

Dr. Thomas P. Cooper, Chairman, Dean and Director, Exten. Ser., Lexington
Dr. Ralph Woods, Director of Vocational Education, Frankfort

Farmer Members	County
Mr. W. E. Cardwell	Hopkins
Mr. Thomas Quisanberry	Clark
Mr. Ben Allen Thomas	Shelby
Mr. R. M. Hagan	Daviess
Mr. Martin Light	Pendleton
Mr. W. O. Watts	Todd

Cooperating Federal Agencies

J. C. McAmis, Director of Dept. of Agri. Relations, TVA, Knoxville
Robert Soaper, Fish and Wildlife Service, Henderson
Mack Galbreath, Sr. Highway Engineer, Pub. Rds. Adm., Frankfort

USDA Representatives

Theo L. Vaughan, State BAE Representative, Lexington
H. L. Bordon, Forest Supervisor, Cumberland National Forest, Winchester
O. M. Farrington, Executive Officer, AAA, Lexington
H. K. Gayle, State Coordinator, SCS, Lexington
Earl Mayhew, State Director, FSA, Lexington
Ernest Rice, Farm Credit Administration, Louisville

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Wm. A. Hartman, 249 Peachtree Street, N. E., Atlanta, Georgia

NORTH CAROLINA

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

I. O. Schaub, Director of Extension Service, Chairman
Roy H. Thomas, State Supervisor, Vocational Education
L. W. Payne, Ass't. to Highway Engineer, State Highway Commission
T. S. Johnson, Consultant, State Planning Board
J. S. Holmes, State Forester, Dept. of Conservation & Development
Warren H. Booker, Director, Div. of Sanitary Eng., State Bd. of Health
R. M. Salter, Director Agriculture Experiment Station, Raleigh
W. K. Scott, State Commissioner of Agriculture, Raleigh

Farmer Members		Counties
Mrs. A. G. Johnson, Lillington	(County Com.)	Harnett
Mrs. Walter Williamson, Yanceyville	(" ")	Caswell
Mrs. W. F. Woodruff, Nashville		Nash
Mrs. Rob't. E. Patterson, Rockwell	(" ")	Rowen
Mrs. J. N. L. Miller, Marion		McDowell
H. C. Forebee, Camden	(" ")	Camden
L. Roy Bradshaw, Burgaw	" "	Pender
R. Hunter Pope, Enfield		Halifax
G. T. Scott, Selma		Johnston
D. P. Troutman, Aberdeen		Moore
D. S. Rhyne, Gastonia	" "	Gaston
Geo. C. Neal, Ruffin	" "	Caswell
John T. Long, Statesville		Iredell
Robert C. Deyton, Green Mt.		Yancey
A. C. Edwards		Greene
J. S. Shields		Cherokee

Cooperating Federal Agencies

C. M. Hartsock, Sr. Highway Engineer, Public Roads Administration

USDA Representatives

R. T. Melvin, BAE Representative, Secretary
E. Y. Floyd, State Executive, AAA
E. B. Garrett, State Coordinator, SCS
Vance E. Swift, State Director, FSA
H. B. Bosworth, Forest Supervisor, Forest Service
J. H. Scarborough, President, Federal Land Bank

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

William A. Hartman, 249 Peachtree St., N. E., Atlanta, Georgia

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

D. W. Watkins, Director of Extension, Chairman, Clemson
H. P. Cooper, Director of Experiment Station, Clemson
H. A. Smith, State Forester, Columbia
O. M. Clark, Extension Service, Clemson
G. H. Aull, Experiment Station, Clemson
G. H. Stewart, REA-Extension Service, Clemson
Miss Lonny Landrun, State Home Demonstration Agent, Rock Hill
Verd Peterson, State Supervisor, Voc. Agriculture, Columbia

Farmer Members		County
Charlie B. Abell, Lowrys		Chester
Preston L. Bethea, Dillon		Dillon
W. A. Campbell, Sheldon		Beaufort
Joseph B. Douthit, Jr., Pendleton		Anderson
Thomas J. Hendrix, Duncan		Spartanburg
Mrs. W. H. Privette, Darlington		Darlington
Mrs. Landrum Sellers, Pauline		Spartanburg
Cliffort T. Smith, Kinards	(County Com.)	Newberry
Thomas T. Traywick, Cope		Orangeburg
Geo. J. Wilds, Jr., Hartsville		Darlington
Mrs. J. L. Williams, Ninety Six		Greenwood
T. C. Moss		Calhoun

Cooperating Federal Agencies

S. A. Obenshain, Highway Engineer, Public Roads Adm., Columbia

USDA Representatives

W. T. Hicks, BAE Representative, Secretary, Clemson
Ernest Carnes, State Coordinator, SCS, Spartanburg
R. W. Hamilton, Administrative Officer, AAA, Columbia
Henry Johnson, Director of Information, FCA, Columbia
R. F. Kolb, State Director, FSA, Columbia
R. J. Reibold, Supervisor, FS, Columbia

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

William A. Hartman, 249 Peachtree Street, N. E., Atlanta, Georgia

TENNESSEE

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

C. E. Brehm, Chairman, Director, Agric. Extension Service
J. O. Hazard, State Forester, State Department of Conservation
C. A. Mooers, Director, Agric. Experiment Station

Farmer Members	County
W. P. Ridley	Maury
W. E. McEwen	Hickman
Otis Plunk	McNairy
C. P. Chase	Shelby
J. F. Porter	Maury
C. G. Henry	Shelby
Homer Hancock	Wilson
Paul Dykes	Rutherford
A. A. Deakins	Washington
N. C. Warren	Dyer
Robert Leeper	Madison
Joel Bell	Robertson
Noe Wilson	Bradley

Cooperating Federal Agencies

J. C. McAmis, TVA, Director of Agr. Relations

USDA Representatives

J. E. Wills, Secretary, State BAE Representative
W. M. Hardy, State Coordinator, SCS
Fred W. Colby, State Administrative Officer, AAA
Paul Gerrard, Supervisor, U.S.F.S.
L. H. Haltom, State Director, FSA

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

William A. Hartman, 249 Peachtree Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

A. W. Drinkard, Director, Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station
J. H. East, President, Virginia Agricultural Conference Board
B. L. Hummel, Leader of LUP, Va. Agricultural Extension Division
John R. Hutcheson, Director, Va. Agricultural Extension Div., Chairman
H. G. Shirley, Commissioner, Va. State Department of Highways
H. N. Young, Head, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, Representative Virginia State Planning Board
W. S. Newman, State Supervisor, Vocational Agriculture
L. M. Walker, Jr., Commissioner, State Dept. of Agri. & Immigration
Meade Ferguson, State Grange
G. F. Holsinger, President, State Farm Bureau Federation
J. R. Horsley, Chairman, State Soil Conservation Committee
P. D. Sanders, Chairman, State FSA Committee

Farmer Members	County
T. M. Painter	Pulaski
D. W. Burrus	Shenandoah
D. D. Ball	Orange
F. B. Sandidge	Amherst
H. W. Coates	Westmoreland
E. J. Knott	Mecklenburg
W. T. Parker	Sussex
Porter Hardy, Jr.	Norfolk
Mrs. H. H. Walton, Pres. Va. Fed. of Home Dem. Clubs	Fredericks Head, Va.
Mrs. J. M. Keller " " " " " "	Abingdon, Va.
Mrs. N. E. McDannald " " " " " "	News Ferry, Va.
Mrs. W. T. Smith " " " " " "	Lincoln, Va.
Mrs. J. M. Peck, " " " " " "	Fincastle, Va.

Cooperating Agencies

T. B. Hutcheson, Head, Dept. of Agronomy, Representative T.V.A.
Burnett McWhorter, Senior Highway Engineer, P. R. A.

USDA Representatives

Lyman Carrier, State Coordinator, SCS
S. K. Cassell, State Executive Officer, AAA
J. K. Doughton, General Agent, Second District, FCA
W. H. Fippin, State Representative, BAE, Secretary
S. H. Marsh, Sr., Regional Forestry Inspector, Region 7, USFS
J. S. Wills, State Director, FSA

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

William A. Hartman, 249 Peachtree St., N. W., Atlanta, Georgia

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
★ SEP 19 1941 ★

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C.

August, 1941.

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF STATE LAND USE PLANNING REPORTS TO AID IN DEFENSE AND MEET THE IMPACTS OF WAR

THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION

Early this year Secretary Wickard requested the aid of State land use planning committees in shaping the course of agriculture and the Government's agricultural programs during the defense emergency. In response to this request, each State committee drafted a set of recommendations for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program. These State reports were then summarized by regions in regional conferences held June 16 to June 24.

The major recommendations from the report for the North Central region are outlined below. The States comprising this region are: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio and Wisconsin.

The State Land Use Planning Committees, which drafted the original reports, are composed of representatives of State and Federal agencies and of farmers from each type-of-farming area in their State. In turn the State committees are one of three levels of agricultural planning committees. The other two are community committees, composed entirely of farmers, and county committees composed of farmers and county representatives of State and Federal agencies, with farmers predominating. A list of the State committee members for the North Central region is attached.

Recommendations of State Land Use Planning Committees in the North Central Region for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program were summarized at a regional conference in Chicago.

Among the problems considered by the committees were special defense situations, health and nutrition, farm labor, forest utilization, marketing and distribution, agricultural finance, a post-defense rural works program,

land use classification and zoning, soil conservation and adjustment and farm tenancy.

Special Defense Situations

Several State committees (Ill., Ia., Mich., Mo., Ind.) gave particular attention to the problems created by the location of defense projects in rural areas. Recommended by the committees were: (a) that, wherever possible, new defense plants should be so located that they will not take large units of productive farm land nor disrupt large numbers of farm families; (b) that displaced families should be given opportunity for defense employment or help in finding and financing suitable new farms; (c) that, wherever possible, new defense industries should be located where conditions are normally favorable for industrial expansion and where unfavorable after-effects can be reduced to a minimum; (d) that defense project plans should include essential community services and facilities needed by defense workers.

Some of the committees favored decentralization of industry into areas of surplus farm population as a means of supplementing farm income. However, they cautioned against fly-by-night industries which might increase part-time farming on an unsound basis, or ultimately leave still more people stranded on the land.

Other committees (Ohio, Mich.) pointed out that agriculture should not be compelled to absorb the shock of general industrial unemployment, and recommended that decentralization take place only on the basis of local resources and to the extent that migration will be unnecessary, and that the United States Department of Agriculture and the State Agricultural Colleges be asked to carry on research projects dealing with part time farming and industrial employment in rural areas.

A few of the committees (Ia., Mich., Minn.) indicated their belief that although national borrowing is needed to get the defense program under way, financing should be met, insofar as possible by taxation. Taxes for defense should be based on ability to pay, and should not bear heavily upon necessities, they held. Curbing of non-defense spending was advocated. All the State committees urged government, labor, industry, and agriculture to develop now long-run policies to deal with the probable maladjustments of the post-war situation.

Health and Nutrition

Virtually all the State committees emphasized the need for a broad national educational program on health, nutrition, and sanitation which would tie together the efforts of all federal, State, and local agencies and groups conducting educational work in this general field.

Home production, preparation, and preservation of adequate food supplies for year-round use was strongly recommended. Most states advocated extension of the school lunch and food stamp plans as a means for better nutrition.

The United States Department of Agriculture and the State Agricultural Colleges were requested to initiate additional studies and surveys on rural health dietary needs, housing and sanitary facilities, and other farm family living problems, and to prepare educational materials in these fields for widespread use.

County and State Land Use Planning Committees, medical associations and agricultural agencies were urged to develop plans to help rural families obtain adequate medical and dental care through cooperative associations or rural health units. Many of the State committees stressed the need for a comprehensive rural housing program.

Education and Information

Almost unanimously, State Land Use Committees in the North Central States recommended substantial expansion of vocational guidance and training programs for youth in rural areas, to better prepare them for both agricultural and non-agricultural occupations.

Agriculture under present conditions cannot absorb all the people growing up in rural areas of many states, and the committees seemed generally agreed that adequate vocational training and guidance is not now available to prepare these young people for industrial employment during and after the present emergency. They pointed out that federal support for such a program is necessary.

Some of the States (Ill., Ia., Mo.) recommended steps to strengthen the morale of adults as well as youth by providing information, organizing study and discussion groups, and educating for democracy.

Farm Labor

To insure sufficient farm labor when and wherever needed, nearly all the Committees recommended that Federal and State Employment Services be staffed to handle farm labor placement, that the program be expanded into all rural areas, and that other local, State and federal agencies cooperate in increasing the registration of laborers and in spreading information on employment opportunities.

Deferment of farm youths in instances where army service will seriously impair operation of an economical farming unit, was suggested by several committees (Ill., Mich., Ohio, Wis.). One or more states also made the following recommendations: That WPA, NYA and CCC should give consideration to seasonal adjustment in enrollment to farm labor peak periods; that WPA workers in a rural area should have the same hours and wage scale that prevails in that rural area;

that WPA workers should be employed on a full-time basis with wages based on monthly rather than hourly income; that studies should be made of the effect of union requirements on rural labor employment, particularly in defense industries.

Forestry

Most of the State Land Use Planning Committees reported that forest lands in the North Central Region are producing only a fraction of their potential benefits to the community, State and nation. The rate of cutting forest lands far exceeds their annual growth, causing a long train of evils.

In general, forest restoration, protection and management are needed. One step advocated in achieving this is a broad educational program. Most reports recommended directly, indirectly, or by implication the need for further acquisition of forest lands by federal, State, county, and in some cases, municipal governments, all based on a proper land use classification.

Private forest holdings should be encouraged and aided through proper forest credits, assistance in technical management, and additional protection, they pointed out. Several states recommended organizing cooperative associations for managing and utilizing forest lands.

The Committees proposed enlargement of the cooperative federal-State program of financing fire control, through additional legislation and appropriations.

Some of the Lake States (Wisc., Minn.) reported the defense program is speeding up forest cutting and exploitation, which may have unfavorable after effects in closing of mills, expanding the area of cut-over lands, and increasing the relief load and fire protection costs.

In general, states making recommendations (Ill., Ind., Minn., Mo., Ohio, Wisc.) agreed that industries should be expanded where species, amounts available on a sustained yield basis, and new uses justify it; and urge cooperative marketing where small ownerships are common. A few states (Ill., Mo., Wisc., Ind.) mentioned the need for additional credit facilities adapted to the needs of owners of forest lands, and to promote development of local wood processing and marketing facilities.

Marketing and Distribution, Including Transportation

Four of the North Central States made recommendations concerning marketing and distribution (Ill., Ind., Mich., and Mo.). One or more of these states emphasized each of the following points: The need for maintaining channels for low cost distribution to keep food costs at a minimum; wider use of official standards for food products; further study of marketing problems by research and marketing agencies; federal and State cooperation in developing uniform laws with respect to interstate trade barriers; a national policy of fair dealing and cooperation with Pan American countries in developing trade relations.

Agricultural Finance

All but one of the Land Use committees in the North Central states cautioned against unwise and overextended use of credit for agricultural expansion. They urged farmers to use any increased income to pay old debts, strengthen their financial position, and make needed adjustments in soil fertility and farm improvement.

Agricultural and educational agencies were urged to carry on a widespread educational program designed to offset any possible overexpansion of credit or inflation of land prices.

A Post-Defense Rural Works Program

All the State reports advocated beginning a long range Rural Conservation Works Program both to accomplish essential work of public benefit and to provide supplemental employment, particularly during the post-war reconstruction period.

Forestry and woodland development were mentioned most frequently; but soil, water and range conservation, housing and sanitation, farm to market roads, rural hospitals, county agricultural buildings, and community recreation facilities were also proposed.

Careful advance planning was urged to avoid "spur of the moment" and "made work" activities whose contribution to the general welfare may be questionable. Some opinion was expressed that present WPA activities in rural communities should be switched to a rural works program, in order to gain experience needed for widespread development in the post-defense situation.

Such a program should fit in with the agricultural adjustments sought by Land Use Planning committees and existing agricultural agencies, the committees emphasized. Work on both privately and publicly owned land was recommended in most cases.

Land Use Classification and Zoning

Immediate preparation of Land Use Classification maps for all counties was urged (Regional Conference recommendation). Such maps would help prevent new settlement on lands incapable of supporting a family and would provide information on the location and characteristics of areas which may be suitable for farming.

Consideration of further extension and more effective use of rural zoning was advocated for certain areas, particularly those better suited to forestry and recreational use than to farming.

Governmental units were urged to follow sound land use policies in managing or disposing of tax delinquent and other publicly acquired lands. Submarginal lands, it was recommended, should be publicly acquired, to be available for occupation only under controlled conditions and in keeping with the objectives of land use planning groups.

A great deal of supervision and financial assistance are necessary to rehabilitate, and in some cases relocate families now living in areas with inadequate soil resources. To this end must be directed the coordinated efforts of the families affected, the agricultural agencies, and the Land Use Planning Committees, the report stated.

Although many of these problems are of long standing, their seriousness will likely be intensified during the present emergency and the following post-defense period unless positive action is taken.

Soil Conservation and Agricultural Adjustment

All the State Land Use committees stressed the importance of coordinated effort by all agencies to encourage soil conservation through the development of a basic long-time conservation plan for the individual farm. Such a plan should be developed in cooperation with the farmer and should be fully acceptable to him.

It would indicate practical adjustments to conserve the land, and would include a current year-to-year plan which would move the farm along progressively toward desirable conservation goals. All appropriate agricultural agencies would be jointly responsible for helping farmers work out such basic farm plans.

Virtually all States urged that State, county and farm allotments should be more in line with a sound land use program and that all direct payments to individual farm operators should depend on compliance with soil conservation and good management practices.

Other proposals: Needed expansion in agricultural production should be encouraged in areas best adapted to the needed crops, and increasing needs met insofar as possible by increasing efficiency and management (Ill., Mich., Minn., Wisc.); commodity loan policies should be continued, but corn loan rates should be adjusted in line with long time price differentials between regions to permit freer movement of corn to deficit areas (Ill., Ind., Mo., Ohio); all agencies should make special program provisions for problem areas (Ill., Ind., Minn., Mo., Ohio); State and federal programs to develop wider uses of agricultural products should be expanded -- for example, use of surplus cotton for mattresses by low income families (Ill., Ind., Mo.)

Tenancy and Tenant Purchase Program

Emphasis was placed also on educational programs to improve landlord-tenant relationships and leasing arrangements. Extension of the tenant purchase program of the Farm Security Administration was generally recommended. Federal land banks, insurance companies and other real estate credit agencies were urged to adopt flexible repayment plans and to give preference to bona fide farm operators in disposing of acquired lands.

Public Finance

Recommendations for strengthening the finances of local government and for solving tax problems were made by a number of states. These fell generally under the following headings:

(a) A study should be made of the possibilities of reducing local governmental costs through consolidation or transfer of functions and consolidation or dissolution of local units.

(b) Assessment procedures should be improved so as to distribute the rural tax burden more equitably.

(c) Local units of government should use currently increased tax revenues, and in some cases even tax levies, to retire debts.

(d) Rural zoning ordinances should be utilized to prevent further scattered settlement resulting in high public costs, to prevent undesirable development in communities affected by the location of defense industries, and to stabilize property values and the tax base.

(e) Federal, State, and County governments should acquire more submarginal and forest lands in certain areas, and remove scattered settlers.

- - - Y - - -

LATEST RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEES

****

NORTH CENTRAL

Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Ohio
Wisconsin

June 30, 1941

ILLINOIS

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

H. P. Rusk, Director of Agri. Experiment Sta. & Extension Service, Chairman
Miss J. Lita Bane, Head of Home Economics Dept. U. of Ill., Urbana
H. Leonard, Illinois State Dept. of Agriculture, Springfield, Director
H. L. Kellogg, State Planning Commission, Chicago
F. J. Koilholz, Extension Editor, U. of Ill., Urbana, Secretary

Farmer Members		Counties
Otto Berlage, Galena		Jo Daviess
N. O. Bradon, Odell	(County Com.)	Livingston
Mrs. J. C. Clifton, Milford		Iroquois
A. O. Eckert, Belleville		St. Clair
A. H. Grunewald, Jr., Plainfield		Will
C. F. Heaton, New Burnside		Johnson
M. M. Land, Carmi		White
E. D. Lawrence, Bloomington		McLean
C. J. McCord, Newton		Jasper
W. W. McLaughlin, Decatur		Macon
M. S. Morgan, Galva		Henry
L. M. Smith, Ozark		Johnson
H. M. Wood, Delavan		Tazewell

Cooperating Federal Agencies

J. T. Voshell, District Engineer, Public Roads Admn., Chicago.
D. H. Janzon, Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Milwaukee

USDA Representatives

V. B. Fielder, BAE Representative, Urbana
L. M. Gentry, Chairman Ill. Agr. Conservation Committee, AAA, Decatur
B. B. Clark, State Coordinator, SCS, Urbana
F. W. Niemeyer, General Agent, FCA, St. Louis, Missouri
A. W. Toole, Forest Supervisor, Shawnee Purchase Unit, Forest Service, Harrisburg
G. H. Reuss, State Director, Rural Rehabilitation Division - FSA, Champaign

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Gladwin E. Young, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

H. J. Reed, Chairman, Director Extension Service, West Lafayette
T. A. Coleman, Associate Director of Extension, West Lafayette
P. A. Yost, State Conservation Department, Indianapolis
George Lommel, Purdue Univ. Chairman, Indiana State Planning Board, West Lafayette
N. T. Schafer, State Highway Commission, Indianapolis
W. V. Lambert, Associate Director, Experiment Station, West Lafayette

Farmer Members

		County
Arthur C. Arnott		Jasper
Clarence Curley	(County Com.)	Vigo
Maurice Douglas		Shelby
Ralph Harvey	(County Com.)	Henry
Wm. Carr Lentz	(County Com.)	Clark
G. L. Morgan		LaPorte
W. B. Singleton	(County Com.)	Clay
Ersol Walley	(County Com.)	Allen
Fred Wiley		Posey
O. A. Baker	(County Com.)	Martin

USDA Representatives

J. B. Kohlmeyer, BAE Representative, Secretary
W. L. Baynes, State Coordinator, SCS
Rudolph Grabow, Forest Supervisor, U. S. Forest Service
Myron Grigg, FCA, Vice President & Treasurer, Federal Land Bank, Louisville, Kentucky
E. H. Shideler, State Director, FSA
L. M. Vogler, AAA

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Gladwin E. Young, 4650 N. Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

R. K. Bliss, Chairman, Director of Extension, Ames
R. E. Buchanan, Director of Experiment Station, Ames
H. H. Kilkee, Dean, Division of Agriculture, Ames
Mark Thornburg, State Dept. of Agriculture, Des Moines
G. B. MacDonald, State Forester, Ames
W. A. Bents, Iowa Conservation Commission, Cresco
W. O. Price, Engineer, Iowa Highway Commission, Ames

Farmer Members

		County
Elmer A. Bass	(County Com.)	Mills
Victor Felter	(County Com.)	Warren
Ed Hotle	(County Com.)	Washington
A. Everett Hursh	(County Com.)	Iowa
Robert Keir	(County Com.)	Clay
Lewis Morris	(County Com.)	Polk
W. S. Rothlisberger	(County Com.)	Fayette
J. C. Skow	(County Com.)	Kossuth
Mrs. Raymond Sayre		Warren
R. M. Wilson	(County Com.)	Sac

USDA Representatives

J. Joe Reed, State BAE Representative, Ames, Secretary
G. W. Smith, Acting Chairman, Iowa Agri. Conservation Comm., Des Moines
Geo. A. Heikens, State Director, FSA, Ames
Frank H. Mendell, State Coordinator, SCS, Ames
E. H. Juntonen, District Supervisor, Forest Service, Des Moines
Raymond Sayre, Member Farm Credit Board of Omaha, FCA, Ackworth

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Gladwin E. Young, 4650 N. Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

R. J. Baldwin, Chairman, Director of Extension
S. G. Fontanna, State Conservation Department
C. E. Miller, Soils Department, Michigan State College
Dorr Stack, Department of Public Instruction
W. F. Ramsdell, Pack Professor of Forestry, University of Michigan

Farmer Members	County
Elwood Bonino	Cass
Russell Bush	Grand Traverse
W. R. Carven	Ingham
Edwin A. Chase	Van Buren
Milford L. Denslow	Mecosta
O. R. Frederick	Alcona
Ernest Gilbert	Hillsdale
John Houk	Mason
Albert Kipfer	Menominee
Wesley G. Mawby	Kent
Arthur Meredith	Sanilac
Geo. H. Raynard	Chippewa
Fred B. Sheppard	Ogemaw
Leonard Swanty	Allegan
Ross Thayer	Midland
Benjamin J. Watters	Montmorency
E. D. Younker	Lapeer

Cooperating Federal Agencies

Fred Taylor, Public Roads Administration (Director of State Highway Planning Sur.)

USDA Representatives

Paul M. Barrett, BAE Representative, Secretary
E. C. Sackrider, State Coordinator, SCS
Maurice A. Doan, Chairman, Michigan Agr. Conservation Committee
R. G. Carr, State Director, FSA
W. I. White, Forest Supervisor, Manistee National Forest
John D. Jones, General Agent, Federal Land Bank, St. Paul, Minn.

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Gladwin E. Young, 4650 N. Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

P. E. Miller, Chairman, Director of Extension
C. H. Bailey, Vice-Director of Experiment Station
S. H. Rutford, Project Leader, Extension Service
Henry G. Weber, Director, State Forestry Division
O. B. Jesness, Chief, Division of Agricultural Economics
H. J. Miller, State Resources Commission
R. A. Trovatten, State Commissioner of Agriculture
W. L. Strunk, State Commissioner of Conservation

Farmer Members	County
William A. Benitt, Hastings	Washington
Ed Graskamp, Fountain	Fillmore
August Koep, Sauk Rapids	Benton
Sevrein P. Viker, Halstad	Norman
Chris Frederikson, Askov	Pine
Carl Martens, Darwin	Meeker
Nels J. Saltnes, Solway	Beltrami
Ben Hanson, Carlton	Carlton
Frank Rhode, Maynard	Chippewa
F. V. Harris, Lynd	Lyon
Roy Wiseth, Goodridge	Marshall
Art Johnson, Meadowlands	St. Louis

Cooperating Federal Agencies

L. J. Charles, Public Roads Administration
Raphael Zon, Director Lake States Experiment Station

USDA Representatives

Roy M. Gilcreast, Secretary, BAE Representative
C. W. Stickney, Chairman of State AAA Committee
Milo Flaten, State Director of FSA
H. A. Flueck, State Coordinator, SCS
J. D. Jones, Jr., General Agent, FCA

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Gladwin E. Young, 4650 N. Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

J. W. Burch, Chairman, Director of Extension
M. F. Miller, Dean, Missouri College of Agriculture
Tom Douglass, Administrative Assistant, State Dept. of Agriculture
J. H. Long, Highway Planning Division
Ed. Mayes, Rep. from Missouri Conservation Commission, Director of State Parks
Carl Brown, Highway Commission

Farmer Members		County
Elmer Adams, Blue Springs	(County Com.)	Jackson
Theodore Anderson, Montreal		Camden
James Arrowsmith, Grove Spring		Wright
B. O. Gideon, Elvins	(County Com.)	St. Francis
E. B. Hamilton, Elmo	(County Com.)	Nodaway
Carl Mueller, O'Fallon	(County Com.)	St. Charles
Albert Painton, Painton	(County Com.)	Stoddard
Eugene Poirot, Golden City	(County Com.)	Lawrence
Tom Raines, Nelson	(County Com.)	Pettis
S. P. Reynolds, Caruthersville		Pemiscot
Howard Shirkey, Richmond		Ray
John Stansberry, Jasper		Barton
Fearis Stephens, Madison		Monroe
Floyd Tuggle, Gallatin		Daviess
Preston Walker, Macon		Macon
B. F. Geisert		Washington
Mrs. L. C. Glover		Miller
Mrs. N. H. Sheppard		Boone
Mrs. Georgia Aton		Green
Mrs. Cora Cassady		Putman
Mrs. Clyde Wilson		Butler
Miss Rose Dieckhouse		Lafayette

Cooperating Federal Agencies

C. T. McGinley, Public Roads Administration
Paul D. Dalke, Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Representative

USDA Representatives

Ross J. Silkett, BAE Representative, Secretary, Columbia
Steve Hughes, Acting Director, FSA
C. W. Sheppard, AAA State Committee Chairman, Warrensburg
K. G. Harman, SCS, State Coordinator, Columbia
Paul D. Kelleter, Forest Service, Forest Supervisor, Clark National Forest
Paul Schowengerdt, FCA, Assistant to General Agent, St. Louis
J. N. Diehl, U. S. Forest Service

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Gladwin E. Young, 4650 N. Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

H. C. Ramsower, Chairman, Director of Extension, Columbus
Edmund Secrest, Director of Experiment Station, Wooster
John F. Cunningham, Dean, College of Agriculture, Columbus
O. A. Alderman, State Forester, Wooster
Miss Minnie Price, State Home Demonstration Leader, Columbus

Farmer Members		County
Paul Smith, West Unity	(County Com.)	Williams
Tell Thompson, Findlay	(County Com.)	Hancock
Harry Kiser, Wapakoneta		Auglaize
Hugh Ulrich, Farmersville		Montgomery
M. C. Pottenger, Harrison		Hamilton
L. P. Vallery, Waverly	(County Com.)	Pike
Harry Silcott, Washington Court House	(County Com.)	Fayette
C. P. Harper, Marion		Marion
Charles H. Cassell, Mt. Vernon		Knox
Henry Leimbach, Vermilion	(County Com.)	Lorain
M. R. Gerig, Smithville		Wayne
Claude F. Cram, Conneaut	(County Com.)	Ashtabula
H. M. Leitnaker, Baltimore		Fairfield
Homer L. Reid, Quaker City		Guernsey
Lloyd Stacy, Lowell		Washington
George H. Lasher, Rutland	(County Com.)	Meigs
Mrs. J. Watts	(County Com.)	Prelle
Mrs. M. Harman		Crawford
Mrs. F. Michael		Holmes
Mrs. G. Forguson		Belmont

Cooperating Federal Agencies

W. V. Buck, Sr. Highway Engineer, Public Roads Administration

USDA Representatives

M. L. Predmore, Secretary, BAE Representative, Columbus
Elmer Kruse, Chairman State Agri. Cons. Program Committee, Columbus
A. L. Sorenson, State Director FSA, Columbus
D. T. Herrman, State Coordinator SCS, Columbus
J. A. Hall, Director Central States Forest Exp. Station, Columbus
E. Rice, General Agent, FCA, Louisville, Kentucky

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Gladwin E. Young, 4650 N. Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

W. W. Clark, Extension Service, Madison, Chairman
Noble Clark, Experiment Station, Madison
R. L. Roettiger, State Highway Department, Madison
M. W. Torkelson, State Planning Board, Madison
Fred G. Wilson, State Conservation Department, Madison

Farmer Members	County
Edward Jenson, Rice Lake	Barron
W. F. Raichle, Galesville	Trempealeau
W. E. Thompson, Kenosha	Kenosha
Fred Weymouth, Plainfield	Waushara
F. E. Oliphant, Marengo	Ashland
Guido Schroeder, West Bend	Washington
G. F. Wild, Elmwood	Pierce
C. Doeringsfeld, Fennimore	Grant

Cooperating Federal Agencies

W. S. Mackintosh, Public Roads Administration, St. Paul, Minnesota

USDA Representatives

W. H. Katterhenry, AAA, Madison
Roy B. Ormand, FSA
John D. Jones, Jr., FCA, St. Paul, Minnesota
J. H. Price, Forest Service, Milwaukee
M. F. Schweers, SCS, Madison
L. G. Sorden, BAE, Madison, Secretary

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Gladwin E. Young, 4650 N. Port Washington Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

1.91
A51

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
★ SEP 19 1941 ★
U. S. Department of Agriculture

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C.

August 1941

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF STATE LAND USE PLANNING REPORTS TO AID IN DEFENSE AND MEET THE IMPACTS OF WAR

THE SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

Early this year Secretary Wickard requested the aid of State land use planning committees in shaping the course of agriculture and the government's agricultural programs during the defense emergency. In response to this request, each State committee drafted a set of recommendations for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program. These State reports were then summarized by regions in regional conferences held June 16 to June 24.

The major recommendations from the report for the south central region are outlined below. The States comprising this region are Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas.

The State land use planning committees, which drafted the original reports, are composed of representatives of State and Federal agencies and of farmers from each type-of-farming area in their State. In turn the State committees are one of three levels of agricultural planning committees. The other two are community committees, composed entirely of farmers, and county committees composed of farmers and county representatives of State and Federal agencies, with farmers predominating. A list of the State committee members for the south central region is attached.

Copies of the national report also are available.

Recommendations of the State Land Use Planning Committees for the South Central States were summarized in a recent regional conference at Little Rock, Arkansas.

The recommendations dealt with the following problems: Health and nutrition; farm labor; forestry; soil conservation; production, prices, and farm management; marketing and distribution, including transportation; Pan-American relations; a post-war rural works program: new settlement in the Mississippi Valley; local government; tenure improvement; and management of tax lands.

Health and Nutrition

The committees from all five States expressed the conviction that agriculture, besides making the adjustments necessary to supply vital foods for defense here and abroad, must see to it that health conditions among the farmers themselves are improved. This calls for widespread improvement in the diets of farmers in the region, the committees indicated, and requires that adequate medical and public health services be provided. The committees also recommended the expansion of educational work on health and nutrition, and suggested ways of getting better coordination among the various agencies carrying on health education.

Increased payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program for home food production and preservation practices were recommended by all States except Arkansas. Louisiana and Mississippi recommended that producers failing to qualify for such payments be penalized through deductions in payments for other practices. It was recommended that the home food provisions of the AAA include practice payments for producing livestock, dairy, and poultry products for consumption on the farm, and for a number of other health improvement practices. Oklahoma and Texas recommended continuation and expansion of the food stamp and school lunch programs. It was suggested that this may require some change in the purchasing and distribution of food supplies for these programs by the Surplus Marketing Administration.

Rural people in the area have long been concerned over the inadequacy of health services available to them. The problem is now intensified by the withdrawal of doctors from rural areas for military service. Hospital and public health services are inadequate in many areas.

Arkansas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma recommended expansion of the type of medical care plan under which Farm Security Administration borrowers budget their funds for medical and dental care.

Farm Labor

Although the State committees reported some probability of seasonal shortages in farm labor in a few areas, it was pointed out that there still is a considerable surplus of farm population in relation to the agricultural resources of the area, and that a large number of workers could be supplied for defense industries if they were properly trained for such work. All committees recommended that present defense training programs be expanded, especially in those areas where a relatively large number of potential workers are available. Some committees suggested that the existence of a large number of potential but untrained workers, living in rural areas but not needed in actual farm work, is a reflection of a tendency to overemphasize agricultural training in rural schools and vocational programs. It was recommended that more adequate facilities be provided for training young people on farms for non-agricultural occupations.

Forestry

Particular concern was expressed over the current exploitation of Southern forest resources. In response to increased demand for forest products, timber cutting has been increased far above the rate of growth. It was recognized by all the committees that defense needs must be met, but it was stated that these needs can be supplied without resorting to wasteful cutting practices. The committees recommended a greatly intensified education program to acquaint owners of forest land with proper forest management methods.

Three committees--Arkansas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma--suggested regulatory laws to prevent forestry exploitation, if continued educational activities should prove to be inadequate. These three States also made other recommendations calling for additional purchases of forest land and potential forest land by public agencies in order to build up the forest resources for future defense and peacetime needs. The Arkansas, Mississippi, and Texas committees indicated a lack of credit facilities suited to forestry, and recommended the establishment of a Federal credit system to provide loans to private forest owners conditioned upon sound forest practices.

Soil Conservation

Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas said that despite the excellent progress made by farmers and agricultural agencies in the south central area during the past few years in dealing with erosion and soil depletion, much work remains to be done. They were unanimous in recommending that conservation efforts of farmers and of local, State, and Federal agencies be continued without interruption during the emergency period. In order to strengthen the conservation provisions of the AAA, Louisiana and Oklahoma recommended that agricultural conservation payments be made on the basis of longtime conservation plans developed for each farm. The committees also cited accomplishments made through the use of organized soil conservation districts. Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas recommended that additional districts be organized where conservation is an important problem.

Production, Prices, and Farm Management

All of the planning committees recommended that cotton farmers, especially those in areas of high production costs, plan their farm operations under a system of management that will decrease their dependence on cotton. Recommendations for facilitating shifts to livestock, dairy, poultry, truck crops, and other enterprises, with the State committees that made them, include the following:

(1) The AAA program should allow farms in high cost areas to replace cotton and wheat with other crops or enterprises without reduction in conservation or parity payments. (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas)

(2) AAA payments for pasture development and improvement, and other practices that accompany shifts away from cotton should be increased, with corresponding reductions in cotton allotment payments. (Louisiana and Oklahoma)

(3) Needed increases in the production of essential foods should be accomplished by increasing the national acreage goals rather than by removing the control provisions. Under this method, part of the increase can be directed into areas that are most seriously affected by loss of export markets. (Oklahoma and Mississippi)

(4) Public and private credit agencies should develop a better basis for extending credit on the production of commodities other than cotton. Mortgage credit agencies should allow some flexibility in annual payments to permit farmers to reorganize their systems of farming. (Mississippi)

(5) Suitable marketing facilities should be developed for marketing products other than cotton. (Oklahoma, Mississippi, and Texas)

(6) Penalties under the marketing quota provisions of the AAA should be increased to prevent non-cooperators from breaking down the program. (Arkansas and Mississippi)

All of the State committees agreed that continued efforts should be made to secure and maintain parity income for farmers.

Marketing and Distribution

The committees from Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas made a number of recommendations concerning marketing problems. Expansion of marketing and storage cooperatives was urged, and it was suggested that the various educational and credit agencies provide more adequate technical guidance to facilitate the establishment and sound operation of such cooperatives. Development of buying cooperatives was also recommended to reduce merchandising costs of supplies and equipment purchased by farmers. Continuance of studies and corrective action dealing with interstate trade barriers and freight rate discrimination were recommended.

Pan-American Relations

Recommendations were made by Arkansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas calling for the strengthening of cultural and economic ties with other American nations. Increased trade with Latin American countries should be stimulated, it was stated by the same four States, through trade agreements and other methods. To prevent further economic penetration of Latin American countries by totalitarian powers, it was suggested by Arkansas and Oklahoma that the United States buy more competitive commodities from the Latin American nations. It was recommended, however,

that the immediate disadvantages of increased purchases of competitive agricultural products should be borne by the nation as a whole rather than by particular groups of agricultural producers.

Post-War Rural Works Program

The belief was expressed by all of the committees that when defense activities begin to decline, peacetime industries may not be able to absorb immediately all of the workers now being drawn from rural areas to defense industries. To counteract this situation it was recommended that plans be developed immediately for a large-scale rural works program. Such a program would include forestry development and improvement, the construction of drainage and flood control works, improvement of rural housing facilities, conservation work of various kinds on both public and private land, the construction of roads, schools, county agricultural buildings, and other similar public facilities. Some of the committees suggested that a rural works program be initiated now on a small scale so that it will be functioning smoothly and able to expand rapidly when the need occurs.

In connection with proposals for rural housing improvement, the committees cited surveys showing the need for better housing, particularly among low-income farm families.

New Settlement in the Mississippi Valley

Committees from Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi disclosed that thousands of families are moving into the areas of alluvial land which have recently become potentially available for agricultural use as a result of flood control measures. They urged that the land in these areas be classified as rapidly as possible according to its best use and that

positive measures be taken to guide and assist the new settlers. A 6-point program was recommended in this connection: (1) development of more adequate educational programs to acquaint new settlers with farming conditions in the area and to guide them to the better lands; (2) enactment of rural zoning ordinances to prevent settlement on land not suited for farming; (3) public purchase of large tracts for development and resale to prospective settlers in family-size units; (4) improvement in purchase contracts now being used by large land owners in the disposition of their lands to new settlers; (5) provision for more adequate credit and debt-adjustment services by Federal lending agencies; and (6) certain adjustments in the AAA program to facilitate the shifting of acreage allotments from poor land to good land, and to prevent undue hardships on existing producers in the areas of new settlement.

Local Government

Consolidation of local governmental services was proposed for efficiency and economy in lessening the tax burden. Recommendations made by Arkansas and Mississippi included the consolidation of county road construction and maintenance under the State highway department, the establishment of State purchasing agencies to purchase materials and equipment for the counties, the expansion of the County Manager System now in operation in some counties, and the consolidation and reorganization of existing drainage districts to reduce maintenance and management costs and to promote coordinated drainage systems within each natural drainage basin.

It was specifically recommended by Arkansas and Louisiana that the refinancing of drainage district bonds by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be conditioned upon consolidation and reorganization of districts,

that Federal works programs give assistance to drainage districts only where unified drainage programs have been worked out, and that the State governments exercise closer supervision over both the financial and engineering features of drainage district operations.

The Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Oklahoma committees pointed out that the present tax assessment procedures tend to promote improper use of the land and exploitation of forest resources. They recommended that technical tax studies be made in cooperation with county agricultural planning committees, looking toward programs of tax equalization.

Tenure Improvement

All the committees pointed out that efforts to conserve soil resources, to make needed adjustments in types of farming, to improve rural housing conditions, and to accomplish many other needed improvements in rural living are being retarded by faulty tenure arrangements. They recommended additional research on tenancy problems and the expansion of tenant aid programs designed to encourage ownership of family-size farms. To insure unified action in dealing with the tenancy problems of the Ozark region, the Department of Agriculture was urged to organize an interstate tenancy committee, to include representatives from Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma.

Management of Tax Lands

Considerable progress has been made during the past few years by some of the States in obtaining more effective management and disposal of tax-forfeited lands. It was pointed out at the Little Rock conference that local planning committees are making a valuable contribution to this work. Notwithstanding recent improvements, modification of existing

State laws was proposed by Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi in order to simplify title clearance of tax lands and to promote proper utilization of lands acquired by tax-forfeiture. Classification of all tax lands was recommended by all committees to insure against resale of lands not suited for farming purposes.

LATEST RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEES

******

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

Arkansas
Louisiana
Mississippi
Oklahoma
Texas

June 30, 1941

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

W. R. Horlacher, Dean, College of Agriculture; Director of Extension Service and Experiment Station, Fayetteville
C. O. Brannon, Asst. Director of Experiment Station, Fayetteville
Fred A. Smith, State Director Voc. Education, Little Rock
L. A. Henry, State Planning Board, Little Rock
Fred H. Lang, State Forester, Little Rock
H. K. Thatcher, State Agri. & Industrial Commission, Little Rock

Farmer Members	County
Shannon Pharr, Lincoln	Washington
Flem Atchley, Osage	Carroll
Fred Williams, Yellville	Marion
John Hobbs, Rudy	Crawford
J. L. Smith, Alexander	Saline
L. C. Sloan, Strawberry	Lawrence
J. J. Little, Conway	Faulkner
G. F. Wallace, Nashville	Howard
Joe Hardin, Grady	Lincoln
R. E. Short, Brinkley	Monroe
Mrs. W. L. Woods, Crossett	Ashley
Mrs. Curtis Chaffin, Moro	Leo
Mrs. Wilbur Jones, Ozan	Hempstead
Mrs. Louis Oates, Morrillton	Conway
Mrs. Maggie Daum, Pleasant Grove	Stone
Mrs. R. C. Harville, Mablevale	Pulaski
Coleman Jernigan	Poinsett
John Naill	Prairie
W. F. Pierce	Desha

Cooperating Federal Agencies

J. M. Page, Public Roads Administration, Little Rock

USDA Representatives

Aubrey D. Gates, Secretary, BAE Representative, Little Rock
R. C. Branch, Chairman.State AAA Committee, Pecan Point
J. B. Daniels, Admin. Officer in Charge, AAA, Little Rock
Hudson Wren, State Director FSA, Little Rock
Glenn, E. Riddell, State Coordinator, SCS, Little Rock
A. L. Nelson, Forest Supervisor, Ouachita Nat'l. Forest, Hot Springs National Park
F. W. Neimeyer, General Agent, FCA, St. Louis, Missouri

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Ralph H. Rogers, New Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Arkansas

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

H. C. Sanders, Acting Director of Extension, University
C. T. Dowell, Director of Experiment Station, University
S. M. Jackson, State Supervisor of Agriculture, Baton Rouge
M. E. Brashears, State Forester, State Dept. of Conservation, New Orleans
Thomas Plunkett, President, Louisiana Farm Council, New Orleans
H. B. Henderlite, State Highway Engineer, La. Highway Comm., Baton Rouge
D. L. Pyburn, State Dept. of Public Works

Farmer Members	County
J. W. Daniel, Somsboro	Lincoln
C. L. Shell, Dodson	Winn
J. A. Ingram, Boyce	Rapides
Philip Lagardo, Thibodeaux	Lafourche
A. D. Kimbrough, Sondheimer	East Carroll
F. E. Landry, Elton	Jefferson Davis
Ubald Melancon, Breaux Bridge	St. Martin
F. O. Bateman, Bogalusa	Washington
Mrs. Milton Porche, Houma	Terrebonne
Mrs. T. C. Kirkpatrick, Melder	Rapides
B. C. Crothers	Concordia
W. A. Tidwell	Livingston
E. F. Lewis	Beauregard
R. M. Ward	Franklin

Cooperating Federal Agencies

M. J. Crammer, Sr. Highway Engineer, Public Roads Adm., Baton Rouge
H. Adams, Fish and Wildlife Service

USDA Representatives

Ben G. Duncan, BAE Representative, University
E. C. McInnis, State Director, FSA, Alexandria
H. B. Martin, State Coordinator, SCS, University
R. L. Thompson, General Agent, FCA, New Orleans
W. R. Paddock, Forest Supervisor, Alexandria
G. J. Durbin, Administrative Officer in Charge, AAA, University

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Ralph H. Rogers, New Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Arkansas

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

*State Agencies

Clarence Dorman, Director of Experiment Station
H. E. Mauldin, Director of Vocational Agriculture Education
C. L. McNeill, General Mgr., Miss. Federated Cooperatives
Ransom Aldrich, President, Miss. Farm Bureau Federation
Fred Merrill, State Forester
W. F. Dearman, Director, State Game and Fish Commission
Si Corlon, State Commissioner of Agriculture
L. I. Jones, Chairman, Director, Agricultural Extension Service
F. J. Underwood, Executive Officer, State Board of Health

Farmer Members	County
C. A. Oakley, Booneville	Prentiss
Dr. J. E. Frazer, Canton	Madison
P. F. Williams, Clarksdale	Coahoma
H. C. Carter, Louisville	Winston
J. A. Randle, Starkville	Oktibbeha
Aubrey Sigrest, Hillsboro	Scott
F. D. Barlow, Hermanville	Claiborne
S. W. Pierce, Collins	Covington
Mrs. F. D. Wade, Hazlehurst	Copiah
Mrs. R. E. Wilkinson, Heidelburg	Jasper
Mrs. Albert Love, Starkville	Oktibbeha
Mrs. Robert Perkins, Belzoni	Humphreys
J. M. Bush	Hinds
Mrs. L. A. Hays	Leake
J. Raymond Saunders	Lafayette
R. B. Harris	Humphreys
J. W. Pope	Perry

*USDA Representatives

Wm. H. Elliott, BAE Representative, Secretary
B. D. Hughes, Forest Supervisor, U. S. Forest Service
C. B. Anders, State Coordinator, SCS
D. C. Vandevere, Acting State Director, FSA
T. M. Patterson, Administrative Officer in Charge, AAA
L. C. Pigford, Asst. Vice-President, Federal Land Bank of New Orleans

Cooperating Federal Agencies

R. B. Deen, District Agent, Fish and Wildlife Service

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Ralph H. Rogers, New Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Arkansas

* Non-voting

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

Ernest E. Scholl, Chairman, Director of Extension Service, Stillwater
W. L. Blizzard, Director of Experiment Station, Stillwater
J. B. Perky, Supervisor, Vocational Agricultural Education, Stillwater
Glen Durrell, Director, Division of Forestry, Planning & Resources Board, Oklahoma City

Farmer Members		County
Mrs. Sumner Beck		Pawnee
J. E. Bifflo	(County Com.)	Garvin
Mrs. Mont Chirchill		Caddo
Glen Dill		Okfuskee
R. J. Haynes		Choctaw
J. A. Heidebrecht	(County Com.)	Nowata
V. L. Hughes		Garfield
C. E. Kaiser		Custer
C. H. Kirdwood		Woodward
L. L. Marlow	(County Com.)	Muskogee
E. H. Molencamp		Caddo
Paul Mullenkopf		Pushmataha
Mrs. Elbert Piper		Woods
Ed L. Rech	(County Com.)	Cherokee
Mrs. W. R. Slaughter		Seminole
Brooks Spence	(County Com.)	Texas
J. H. Sullivan	(County Com.)	Greer
R. C. Surber	(County Com.)	Carter

Cooperating Federal Agencies

Dr. A. E. Gray, District Agent, Fish and Wildlife Service, Okla. City
J. S. Logan, Highway Engineer, Public Roads Administration, Okla. City
Ira T. Goddard, Supervisor of Extension, U. S. Indian Service, Oklahoma City

USDA Agencies

Earl T. Etter, BAE Representative, Stillwater, Secretary
J. C. Wright, Acting Admin. Officer in Charge, AAA, Stillwater
Wilson Cowen, Regional Director, FSA, Amarillo, Texas
E. Lee Osbirn, State Director, FSA, Oklahoma City
John Nelson, State Director, U. S. Forest Service, Oklahoma City
Leo S. Wortman, State Coordinator, SCS, Stillwater
Fred R. Merrifield, FCA, Wichita, Kansas

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Ralph H. Rogers, New Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Arkansas

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

H. H. Williamson, Chairman, Extension Service, College Station
A. B. Connor, Experiment Station, College Station
R. A. Manire, State Board of Vocational Education, Austin
C. S. Clark, State Board of Water Engineers, Austin
E. O. Siecke, Texas Forest Service, College Station
W. J. Tucker, Game, Fish & Oyster Com., Austin
D. C. Greer, Texas Highway Department, Austin
V. C. Marshall, State Soil Conservation Board, Temple
Dr. G. W. Cox, State Board of Health

Farmer Members	County
Mrs. Lillia L. Wise	Galveston
Henry T. Fletcher	Presidio
Calvin M. Caraway	Comanche
J. B. Forgason	Hansford
Arnold E. Ferguson	Hansford
Chanaler E. Weymouth	Potter
Mrs. Berta McClure Harmon	Lubbock
Harper H. Nixon	Wilbarger
George Q. Payne	El Paso
Joe M. Vander Stucken	Sutton
Richard C. Miller	Jim Wells
Mrs. Emma L. Talley	Frio
John B. Chambers, Jr.	Willacy
Hayden Perry	Nueces
Ervin W. Harrison	Young
Mrs. Elizabeth J. Starr	Eastland
David H. Carter	Coryell
Mrs. Iola Scott Middleton	Hill
Guy H. Bullock	Dallas
William R. Brown	Titus
Mrs. Sarah Taylor Duncan	Smith
Thomas P. Walton	Trinity
Joe T. Locke	Brazos
Robert E. Wilson	Hale

Cooperating Federal Agencies

W. P. Taylor, Fish and Wildlife Service, College Station
O. D. Kercher, Public Roads Administration, Austin

USDA Representatives

George Slaughter, AAA, Wharton
W. B. Orr, Secretary, BAE Representative, College Station
Jack Shelton, FCA, Houston
P. H. Walser, SCS, College Station
W. E. Webb, U. S. Forest Service, Wichita Falls
C. T. Watson, FSA, Amarillo
E. R. Henson, Southern Great Plains, Amarillo
V. P. Lee, Production Credit Corporation
Allen F. Miller, U. S. Forest Service
Rex B. Baxter, State R. R. Director; FSA

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Ralph H. Rogers, New Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Arkansas

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
★ SEP 19 1941 ★
U. S. Department of Agriculture

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C.

August, 1941.

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF STATE LAND USE PLANNING REPORTS TO AID IN DEFENSE AND MEET THE IMPACTS OF WAR

THE NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS REGION

Early this year Secretary Wickard requested the aid of State land use planning committees in shaping the course of agriculture and the Government's agricultural programs during the defense emergency. In response to this request, each State committee drafted a set of recommendations for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program. These State reports were then summarized by regions in regional conferences held June 16 to June 24.

The major recommendations from the report for the Northern Great Plains region are outlined below. The States comprising this region are: North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana and Wyoming.

The State Land Use Planning Committees, which drafted the original reports, are composed of representatives of State and Federal agencies and of farmers from each type-of-farming area in their State. In turn the State committees are one of three levels of agricultural planning committees. The other two are community committees, composed entirely of farmers, and county committees composed of farmers and county representatives of State and Federal agencies, with farmers predominating. A list of the State committee members for the Northern Great Plains region is attached.

Copies of the national report also are available.

Recommendations of the State Land Use Planning Committees of the 6 Northern Great Plains States were summarized in a regional conference at Lincoln, Nebraska. Among the problems considered were special defense situations, health and nutrition, education and information, farm labor, soil conservation and water utilization, forest and range utilization, marketing and distribution, agricultural finance, a post-defense rural works program, land retirement and new land settlement, and production adjustment.

Major recommendations for fulfilling agriculture's obligations in the national defense program and cushioning the post-war shock of readjustment included: A program to minimize the unfavorable elements which may accrue from over-expansion in livestock numbers and lumbering, attended by over-grazing and over-cutting as a direct result of the defense program; a program to return additional acreages submarginal for wheat to livestock production; a broad post-war public works program; steps to expand vocational training and guidance of rural youth for non-agricultural pursuits; a program to meet any possible farm labor shortages; steps to hold in line prices that farmers pay for goods and services with prices they receive for goods and services.

Special Defense Situations

If defense industries are to be decentralized into the area, the committees recommended (Montana, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota) that full consideration should be given to continuing plant operations in the production of peacetime commodities during the critical post-war readjustment period.

They also recommended (Regional Conference comment) that priorities be given to farm machinery as soon as the extremely essential defense orders have been satisfied, and that farm machinery prices be kept in line with farm income.

Health and Nutrition

All the State Land Use Planning committees in the Northern Great Plains considered health and nutrition as particularly essential to national morale and unity during the emergency.

They recommended expanding the following programs already under way, until they reach all farm families: Carry on an effective educational program on adequate diets including the preservation, storage and proper use of food products;

continue and expand the food stamp plan to those people just above the "relief level" as well as to those on relief; serve all rural school children a hot lunch containing essential food elements (Kansas, South Dakota, Montana, and Nebraska).

Further recommendations: Extend associations for medical services (Nebraska, Montana, Kansas); effectively coordinate policies and activities of various agencies dealing with health corrective measures (Kansas, Montana, Nebraska); provide more adequate housing facilities at greatly reduced costs, including better housing for part-time agricultural workers (Montana).

The committees all took note of the unusually fast tempo of life resulting from ever accelerating defense activities, and regarded recreation as particularly essential to high morale under these conditions.

They pointed out that existing recreational facilities are not adequate in rural areas of the Northern Great Plains and will probably require additional grants-in-aid to properly develop such facilities so that they may be made available now when the need is so great.

Education and Information

All state land use committees in the area recommended that the vocational training and guidance programs be greatly expanded and that such expansion be financed by additional grants-in-aid. They also recommended creation of national trade schools to supplement high school training; and revision of the entire educational system to include more systematic arrangements for helping "out of school" as well as "in school" people to study, discuss and understand the national defense program -- particularly as it relates to agriculture.

Farm Labor

Although there is no general shortage of farm labor in the Northern Great Plains now, there is a shortage in certain areas which may possibly become general as the war continues. Hence, all state committees in the region recommended that a well organized program for handling the farm labor situation should be started immediately.

This program would provide for registration of all qualified farm laborers for shifting them from areas of surplus to areas of scarcity, for continuation for the W. P. A. policy of releasing qualified men if the labor supply from other sources is exhausted, and "for the deferment from military service of farm boys and farm machinery mechanics who will be all the more essential if there develops a shortage of farm machinery."

The regional report comments, "Adjustments in farm wages should be made possible by an increase in farm income so that agriculture is in a more favorable position to compete in the labor market."

All State Land Use Committees in the Northern Great Plains recognize the gravity of the present defense situation and insist that every practical means be employed which will make the defense program a success. However, they are equally insistent that "now, while the need is not immediately upon us, full recognition be given to consideration of the post-war period."

Soil Conservation and Water Utilization

Conservation and utilization of soil and water are not incompatible objectives. However, since these resources are exhaustible, "all out" defense activities must not be allowed to jeopardize them permanently, the committees pointed out (Montana, South Dakota).

They recommended these activities wherever applicable: Improvement and expansion of educational programs on conservation (Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming); extension of soil conservation districts (Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota and South Dakota); when local conditions indicate a need for such projects in bringing about long-term adjustments more soil classification as a basis for conservation planning (South Dakota, Montana); make as large a proportion of AAA funds as possible available to start and maintain conservation practices (Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska); plan for, begin now, and greatly expand during the post-war period a rural public works program of soil and water conservation (Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, North Dakota, Wyoming).

Forest and Range Utilization

State Land Use Planning committees in the area expressed their concern over two problems which may arise from the present war and defense activities: (1) Protection of forest resources from fires set by subversive groups, and from wasteful logging to meet increased lumber demands (Montana, South Dakota); and (2) proper utilization of range resources (all States).

The group recommended that livestock numbers not be increased out of proportion with the long time carrying capacity of the ranges merely because of high war-time price or war-time demands.

They pointed out that unless such a policy is adhered to, the entire economy of the area may be thrown off balance for many years to come. Some expansion of livestock numbers may be facilitated by the shifting of large acreages of land, which have proven to be submarginal for wheat production, to grass. Complementing such a shift is the increase in acreage of forage which will contribute to the support of some additional livestock.

Marketing and Distribution, Including Transportation

Cooperative buying and selling will help to make the most effective use of marketing and transportation facilities during the defense emergency, the State committees pointed out (Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas). Similarly, cooperative use of farm machinery and other production equipment may help greatly to relieve any shortages arising from decreased production in favor of defense goods (Nebraska, South Dakota, Kansas).

The various state committees in the Northern Great Plains definitely recognize the need for increasing Pan-American trade and cultural relationships, but insist that non-agricultural peoples must bear their proportionate share of any concessions essential to hemisphere solidarity, (Montana, Kansas, South Dakota).

Agricultural Finance

The State Land Use committees of the Northern Plains recognize the urgent need for increasing agricultural production to meet the demands of an "all out" program, but counsel against "loose credit" policies. They point out several means to step up output without a correspondingly great increase in credit expenditures.

These methods include cooperative use of credit for buying and using production equipment, cooperative ownership of production stock such as herd sires, more efficient farm organization and management practices, the preparation and use of farm budgets and financial statements by a family council, and a habit of buying only essential articles.

The State committees note that relatively high prices now being paid for farm products give farmers an opportunity to pay off or reduce old debts that are unprofitable but warn that unless prices which the farmers pay for goods and services are kept in line with prices which they receive for goods and services

it will not only be impossible to liquidate debts but will be conducive to acquiring additional indebtedness.

Rural Works Program

All these committees recommend that detailed plans be developed for a post-defense rural works program including soil and water conservation, forestry, farm to market roads and military roads, rural electrification, insect and weed control, community buildings, recreational facilities, wild life conservation and development, rural housing and sanitation, and airport development.

These plans should be designed specifically to meet rural conditions. They would take into account the types of projects needed, the capabilities of rural labor, the seasonal character of farm labor, the longtime effect of the project on the economy of the area, and the effect the project will have on the morale and self respect of the people. The committees suggest that a rural works program should be on a contract or some comparable basis instead of a relief work basis.

Land Retirement and New Land Settlement

Wherever there is any question about the suitability of land for its present use, the committees recommended that it be classified before any action is taken to develop new land or to permanently retire land from its present use, except in cases where individuals can and wish to finance the shift themselves (North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana).

The Land Use Committees in all the Great Plains States realize the difficulty of shifting high hazard cropland and cutover land to other uses, but feel that many millions of acres now being cultivated should be returned gradually to use for livestock grazing. They urge continuation and expansion of present programs which promote retirement of such land through benefit payments and other inducements, and recommend additional inducements in some instances, to speed up the shift from cash grain farming to livestock.

Measures to facilitate the retirement or proper use of land resources in cutover and high-hazard areas, such as zoning, cooperative grazing associations, and soil conservation districts where applicable, were heartily endorsed by State Committees in all of the Great Plains States.

Production Control and Adjustment

In general, the State committees of the Northern Plains endorsed the production adjustment and control activities, which "have already proven extremely effective" in meeting emergency defense needs as well as in solving long-time problems.

However, they recommend additional inducements for shifting the economy of the area more and more to livestock, along with the regrassing of lands unfit for wheat (entire region).

Such inducements would include greater emphasis on payments for conservation and less on payments for staying within allotments (Montana, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota); maintenance payments for cultivated land which has been reverted to grass (Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska); the requirement of certain practices for full A.C.P. payments such as growing feed crops, pasture and home gardens, trench silos and other storage facilities (Kansas, South Dakota, and Nebraska).

All the committees urged expansion of such agricultural adjustment and control activities as marketing quotas, commodity loans, surplus removal and disposal, and parity payments. They pointed out, however, that while adjustment and parity payments are desirable, as things stand at present, the ultimate national goal should be to organize the economy in such a way that it can avoid periodic unemployment, and can absorb surplus farmers (South Dakota, Montana).

The committees (Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota) urged "every inducement" to encourage family-sized farms, getting away from farms that are much too small to support a family adequately, and from excessively large farms such as those operated by "sidewalk farmers." Graduated agricultural adjustment payments were suggested as a means of reaching this ideal.

- - - Y - - -

LATEST RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEES

****

NORTHERN GREAT PLAINS

North Dakota
South Dakota
Nebraska
Kansas
Montana
Wyoming

June 30, 1941

NORTH DAKOTA

STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

E. J. Haslerud, Chairman, Director, Extension Service, Fargo
H. L. Walster, Director, Experiment Station, Fargo

Farmer Members		COUNTIES
Fred Aandahl, Litchville		Barnes
R. R. Gibbons, Cando		Towner
Harry Haroldson, Coteau	(County Com.)	Burke
H. W. McInnes, Kelso	(County Com.)	Traill
James Maher, Morristown, S.D.		Sioux
Albert Mork, DesLacs		Ward
John O'Keefe, Lansford		Bottineau
Glen Talbott, Merricourt		Dickey

Cooperating Federal Agencies

*G. E. Eldred, Senior Highway Engineer, PRA, Bismarck
Burnie Maurek, Fish and Wildlife Service, Minneapolis, Minn.

USDA Representatives

John Muehlbeier, Secretary, BAE Representative, Fargo
Harry Lohse, Chairman, Agricultural Conservation Committee, Fargo
Walter Maddock, State Director, FSA, Bismarck
A. D. McKinnon, State Coordinator, SCS, Bismarck
F. E. Cobb, State Director, FS, Jamestown
*John D. Jones, FCA, St. Paul

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Robert Clarkson, 349 Union Terminal Warehouse, 901 N. 17th St., Lincoln, Nebraska.

*Non-voting

SOUTH DAKOTA

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

John V.Hepler, Chairman, Director of Extension, Brookings
I. B.Johnson, Director State Experiment Station, Brookings
Millard Scott, Director Rural Credit, Pierre
E. H. Everson, Secretary, State Department of Agriculture, Pierre
Charles Rudd, State Highway Commission, Pierre
Earl Hammerquist, Dept. School & Public Lands, Pierre
Dean Loucks, State Engineer, Pierre
A. M. Eberle, Dean of Agriculture, State College

Farmer Members		Counties
Paul W. Opsahl		Spink
Alex M. Rowen	(County Com.)	Hand
O. S. Thompson	(County Com.)	Minnehaha
J. H. Lemmon	(County Com.)	Perkins
Ren T. Wilcox		Tripp
Raymond P. Johnson		Pennington
Mrs. George Larson		Kingsbury
Miss Nina Zeller		Brown
Mrs. Ernest B. Ham		Meade
John C. Dawson		Union
Neere Luitjens		Marshal
H. L. Willrodt		Brule

Cooperating Federal Agencies

L. C. Lippert, Indian Service, Fort Yates
H. C. Beall, Public Roads Admin., Pierre
Watson Beed, Fish and Wildlife Service, Columbia
F. C. Youngblutt, Reclamation Service, Newell

USDA Representatives

Ralph E. Johnston, Secretary, BAE Representative, Brookings
A. R. Barnes, Chairman, State AAA Committee, Huron
Emil Loriks, State FSA Director, Huron
Ross D. Davies, State Coordinator, SCS, Brookings
A. L. Ford, Director, Prairie States Shelterbelt Project, FS, Brookings
E. V. Jones, Coop. Fed'l. & S.D. Crop & Livestock Reporting Service, Sioux Falls
R. C. Engberg, Farm Credit Administration, Omaha, Nebraska

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

, Robert Clarkson, 349 Union Terminal Warehouse, Lincoln, Nebraska

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

W. W. Burr, Director, Agricultural Experiment Station, Lincoln
W. H. Brokaw, Director, Agricultural Extension Service, Chairman, Lincoln
G. E. Condra, Director, Conservation and Survey Div., Lincoln
A. E. Anderson, Statistician, Agricultural Marketing Service, Lincoln.
L. D. Clements, Dept. of Vocational Education, Lincoln
W. G. Scott, Department of Roads and Irrigation, Lincoln

Farmer Members		Counties
George Beitel, Wilcox	(County Com.)	Franklin
Cassius Kennedy, Brownville		Nemaha
C. S. Reece, Simeon		Cherry
Dan Rush, Jackson		Dakota
W. T. Young, Jr., Kimball	(County Com.)	Kimball
D. S. Dalby, Beatrice	(County Com.)	Gage

Cooperating Federal Agencies

E. J. Babcock, Bureau Manager, Public Roads Administration, Lincoln

USDA Representatives

Arthur Anderson, BAE Representative, Lincoln
R. C. Engborg, Director of Research, FCA, Omaha
John L. Emerson, State Director, Forest Service, Grand Island
L. R. Leonard, FSA, Lincoln
R. E. Engstrom, State Coordinator, SCS, Lincoln
Fred S. Wallace, State Chairman Agricultural Conservation Program Committee, Lincoln

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Robert Clarkson, Room 349, Union Terminal Warehouse, 901 N. 17th St., Lincoln, Nebraska

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

H. J. C. Umberger, Director of Extension, Chairman, Manhattan
L. E. Call, Director of Experiment Station, Manhattan
Lester B. Pollom, Supervisor of Vocation Agriculture, Topeka
Robert Smrha, State Board of Agriculture, Topeka
H. R. Miller, Director of State Planning Board, Topeka
Franklin T. Rose, State Highway Commission, Topeka
Frank Sullivan, State Board Administration, Topeka

Farmer Members	Counties
Ernest Gillen, Independence	Montgomery
George Hill, Buffalo	Woodson
Scott E. Kelsey, Topeka	Shawnee
F. J. Herrmann, Sabetha	Nemaha
Henry Rogler, Matfield Green	Chase
Jack W. Carlin, Saline	Saline
Wallace McIlrath, Kingman	Kingman
Herbert Cornwell, Osborne	Osborne
Charles A. Lash, Belleville	Republic
John L. Dean, Kinsley	Edwards
Wm. Shank, Bazine	Ness
Dan Jackson, Coldwater	Comanche
Fred T. Gatlin, Atwood	Rawlins
Charles F. Durham, Selkirk	Wichita
Felix Edmisson	Stanton
E. T. Fortune, St. Paul	Neosho
C. A. Payne, Altamont	Labette
Ed. Starry, Louisburg	Miami
Ed. Brune, Bethel	Wyandotte
G. S. Wilkin	Osage
W. W. Sondker	Jackson
R. D. Shaw, Lawrence	Jefferson
L. H. Libel, Leona	Doniphan
L. J. Hoover, Junction City	Geary
Vernon Moore, Council Grove	Morris
E. J. Mall, Clay Center	Clay
Jonas Voran, Moundridge	Harvey
R. D. Wyckoff, Luray	Russell
Frank Osthoff, Clayton	Norton

Continued

Kansas (cont'd)

Farmer Members (cont'd)	Counties
S. W. Schneider, Logan	Phillips
H. A. Praeger, Claflin	Barton
Irtis Ward, Preston	Stafford
George H. Goebel, Jetmore	Hodgeman
J. R. Bosworth, Garden City	Finney
T. O. Morgan, Hugoton	Stevens
L. W. Murphy, Sublette	Haskell
Ned B. Estes, Minneola	Clark
Henry Abt, Medicine Lodge	Barber
Walter J. Trachsel, Goodland	Sherman
H. W. Hickert, Bird City	Cheyenne
C. E. Rector, Kendall	Hamilton
F. D. Strickler	Reno
N. J. Seidel	Mitchell
C. Danielson	Cloud
Mrs. Otto Mayberry	Montgomery
Mrs. Harold Staadt	Franklin
Mrs. Audley Porter	Johnson
Mrs. Irving Groh	Doniphan
Mrs. Stacy Bell	Butler
Mrs. Howard Fry	Dickinson
Mrs. Asa Neel	McPherson
Mrs. Elvis Carter	Russell
Mrs. Logan Leonard	Smith
Mrs. A. B. Hays	Hodgeman
Mrs. L. A. Lix	Ford
Mrs. Charlie R. Jackson	Comanche
Mrs. Gladys Born	Graham
Mrs. Herbert Rudd	Greeley
Albert A. Allen	Scott

Cooperating Federal Agencies

George W. Loomis, Public Roads Administration, Topeka

USDA Representatives

Roger Stewart, BAE Representative, Secretary, Manhattan
E. H. Leker, Executive Assistant, AAA, Manhattan
George McCarty, Director, Farm Security Administration, Topeka
Lionel C. Holm, Farm Security Administration, Amarillo, Texas
Ira K. Landon, Soil Conservation Service, Manhattan
Russell Reitz, Forest Service, Manhattan
F. R. Merrifield, Farm Credit Administration, Wichita

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

James C. Foster, Land Office Bldg., Colorado State College, Fort Collins, Colo.

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

J. C. Taylor, Chairman, Director of Extension Service, Bozeman
Clyde McKee, Director of Experiment Station, Bozeman
M. J. Steere, Office Engineer, Montana Highway Commission, Helena
H. C. Biering, Field Representative, State Land Department, Helena

Farmer Members		Counties
W. A. Allison, Billings	(County Com.)	Yellowstone
A. R. Anderson, Sioux Pass	"	Richland
W. A. D'Ewart, Wilsall	"	Park
W. D. Reiquam, Choteau	"	Teton
John Weinschrott, Plevna	"	Fallon
R. J. Ellis, RR 2, Kalispell	"	Flathead
Matt Reichmuth	"	Fergus

Cooperating Agencies

J. R. English, Bureau Manager, Public Roads Administration, Helena

USDA Representatives

Ray B. Haight, Secretary, BAE Representative, Bozeman
R. J. McKenna, Acting Chairman, State AAA Committee, Bozeman
Thomas Horsford, State RR Director, FSA, Bozeman
Truman C. Anderson, State Coordinator, SCS, Bozeman
H. H. Gurley, Forest Service, Missoula
E. J. Bell, Ass't. to General Agent, FCA, Spokane, Washington

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Robert Clarkson, Room 349, Union Terminal Warehouse, 901 N. 17th St.,
Lincoln, Nebraska

WYOMING

STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

A. E. Bowman, Director of Extension, Laramie
J. A. Hill, Director, State Experiment Station, Laramie
L. C. Bishop, State Engineer, Cheyenne
Ralph H. McFarland, Acting Commissioner, State Dept. of Agr., Cheyenne
Will M. Lynn, State Board of Equalization, Cheyenne
J. L. Simmins, Supt. State Highway Commission, Cheyenne

Farmer-Rancher Members	County
Mrs. E. L. Taylor	Uinta
Mrs. Mae Urbanek	Niobrara
Mrs. Margaret Cameron	Goshen
Harland H. Holwell	Creek
Frank Long	Johnson
Ralph D. Mercer	Big Horn
Gordon Sanford	Natrona
Alfred E. Toland	Lincoln
Mrs. Mattie Wallace	Washakie
Harry Trembley	Fremont
Earl Flaharty	Albany
W. C. Howard	Platte

Cooperating Federal Agencies

W. J. Kelley, Public Roads Admn., Denver, Colo.
Adolph Hamm, Fish and Wildlife Service, Cheyenne

USDA Representatives

Glen Hartman, State BAE Representative, Laramie, Wyo.
J. J. McElroy, Executive Officer, AAA, Laramie, Wyo.
J. E. Morgan, State Director, FSA, Laramie, Wyo.
E. A. Reeves, Acting State Coordinator, SCS, Laramie, Wyo.
Col. Allen S. Peck, Regional Forester, Forest Service, Denver, Colo.
Gwynn Garnett, Asst. Director of Research, FCA, Omaha, Nebr.

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Robert Clarkson, 349 Union Terminal Warehouse, 901 N. 17th St, Lincoln, Nebraska.

1.11
15

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C.
August 1941

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF STATE LAND USE PLANNING REPORTS TO AID IN DEFENSE AND MEET THE IMPACTS OF WAR

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION

Early this year Secretary Wickard requested the aid of State land use planning committees in shaping the course of agriculture and the government's agricultural programs during the defense emergency. In response to this request, each State committee drafted a set of recommendations for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program. These State reports were then summarized by regions in regional conferences held June 16 to June 24.

The major recommendations from the report for the Pacific Northwest are outlined below. The States comprising this region are Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

The State land use planning committees, which drafted the original reports, are composed of representatives of State and Federal agencies and of farmers from each type-of-farming area in their State. In turn the State committees are one of three levels of agricultural planning committees. The other two are community committees, composed entirely of farmers, and county committees composed of farmers and county representatives of State and Federal agencies, with farmers predominating. A list of the State committee members for the Pacific Northwest is attached.

Copies of the national report also are available.

The State Committees of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho at a recent regional conference at Spokane recommended a broad program "in the belief that full and adequate defense calls for a full and wise use of all resources with security, well-being, and opportunities of useful service for all the people." The summary of the State reports declared that the total agriculture of the region can make a large contribution to defense by producing adequately even with a curtailed labor supply, through adjusting production to changed demands and through conservation measures that would contribute to long-time as

well as immediate defense needs.

The regional summary put together the State recommendations under the following headings: Special defense situations; health and nutrition; education and information; farm labor; forestry; soil conservation and water utilization; range utilization; production, prices, and farm management; marketing and distribution; a rural works program; readjustment after the war; land use policies and tenure; and other problems.

Special Defense Situations

Among these special defense situations were included the transportation problem; uncertainty as to how long the increased demand for defense foods will last; farmers displaced by purchase or lease of land for defense uses; problems of supplying farm products to defense industries and military establishments within the region; and the prospects of serious unemployment and loss of markets at the close of the defense period.

Recommendations for action on these problems were made by all three States. They urged cooperation by military agencies in furnishing information on numbers of men to be stationed at given camps, and on contemplated changes in numbers so that farmers may plan their farm production and marketing accordingly. Organized grower groups were urged to pool their produce so as to supply the grade and quantity needed by the government purchasing agencies. Government contracts for food and fiber supplies should be fulfilled, it was stated, even after the close of the present preparedness or war period. The committees also urged that prices of farm machinery and parts be held in line to

prevent increased production costs, and to enable farmers to acquire needed new machinery to offset labor lost to defense industries and the military services.

Health and Nutrition

The committees in the Pacific Northwest also recognized the need for a broad program on health and nutrition, both to increase the efficiency and vigor of people in the defense period, and also for the long run. Such a program would include a widespread educational effort to teach all families the constituents of an adequate diet; increases in farm gardens, and supplies of vegetables, fruits and dairy products sufficient to provide for every family throughout the year. Extension of the food stamp plan and surplus marketing were recommended as a means of improving the diet of low-income families.

Education and Information

An intensive rural education program was proposed by the three States in order to familiarize farm people with the facts of the defense situation, and to inform them of the adjustments and activities needed to meet this situation. A general strengthening and broadening of vocational training and guidance of rural youth also was suggested as a means of contributing to the defense effort of providing opportunities to young people.

Farm Labor

Viewing present and prospective shortages in the farm labor supply, the committees reported that a comprehensive effort is being

made to correlate and increase the services of employment agencies, the Farm Security Administration, the WPA and other agencies in determining the demand for and supply of farm labor, and to provide efficient placement and distribution of labor.

Specific recommendations on this subject included vocational training in essential farm labor skills, the release of qualified WPA workers during periods of peak demand; harvest vacations for high school boys; provision for harvest furloughs of army personnel, if necessary; the establishment of additional mobile camps for farm labor; and the organizing of conciliation committees to assist in settling farm labor disputes. Long-time proposals included studies of subsistence homesteads where farm laborers could employ themselves in slack periods; and studies of changes and diversification in cropping systems as a means of providing more continuous employment for farm labor.

Forestry

The committees reported that timber is one of the major contributions which the agricultural resources of the Pacific Northwest are making to defense. A large part of the remaining old growth timber supplies of the Nation are in this region, and logging and lumber manufacture is going on at a fast rate for defense use. The consequent threat to timber stands is a problem typical of those which the agricultural planning committees are attempting to solve. These increased logging operations were reported by the three States as creating the immediate problem of increased fire hazard. They proposed also a long-time program of stabilizing the region's forest economy.

The committees recommended a broad program of improved fire, insect, and disease protection; the application of approved forestry practices designed to leave forests in a productive condition after logging; development of sustained yield units; forest nursery and tree planting programs; public forest acquisition; adjustment of forest taxation; a forest credit system; farm forestry; a reservoir of forest work projects for the post-defense period; and expanded research, forest inventory and forest land classification.

For immediate action, emphasis was placed upon the strengthening of fire protection, the prevention of needless waste in current timber operations, and the application of good forest practices in logging.

Soil Conservation and Water Utilization

Soil and water were recognized by the committees as the basic resources upon which all agricultural enterprises of the region depend. Their conservation, it was stated, is of primary importance. A number of areas in the region were reported as having serious wind and water erosion problems. Land classification was recommended to provide a basis for more comprehensive action; and increased emphasis on conservation in the AAA program was urged. Other recommendations included the determination by county agricultural planning committees of areas where soil conservation districts are needed; the restoration of fertility by use of animal manures, commercial fertilizers, and green manure crops; and the control of land settlement and development to prevent destructive and exploitive soil use.

In order to help in meeting the immediate needs of the defense program it was stated that emphasis in water development and control should be placed on rehabilitation and development of water supplies for existing irrigation projects, small new projects, and domestic and livestock water supplies.

Range Utilization

The committees were all of the opinion that the ranges of the Pacific Northwest are stocked to a reasonably safe maximum, and that good range utilization and conservation required precautions against over-expansion under the stimulus of current good prices.

Proposals for immediate consideration included fattening of feeder livestock on grain and hay surpluses in the region; the moving of steers and barren cows into surplus crop-producing areas for feeding; and greater use of improved pasture. Long-time goals included the maintenance of a balance between livestock and feed resources; the use of range for long-time sustained yield; and extensive range improvement, including roads to inaccessible areas, stock water development, fencing, reseeding, and control of predators and rodents.

Production, Prices, and Farm Management

The State committees stressed caution against over-expansion and over-investment under the incentive of temporary conditions; care in selecting lands for new farm development; adjustments in size and type of farming and in farming methods to provide a more adequate farm family living; and abandonment of farming on submarginal land. Their recommendations placed emphasis on conservation, diversification, in-

creased efficiency of farm operations, increased production of foods for defense--hogs, butter, eggs, and poultry--to the extent of present breeding capacity, housing facilities, and food supplies.

It was particularly urged that farmers do not over-expand their operations through the use of agricultural credit. Expansion of credit should be based upon normal earning capacity of farm units, and not upon temporarily inflated prices, it was stated. Farmers were urged to pay off their debts in a manner consistent with a saving of adequate working capital and cash reserves for emergencies. Public and private credit agencies, in turn, should have as their primary aim the encouraging of family-sized farm operations, the committees said.

Dealing with agricultural adjustment in crop and livestock production, the committees pointed to the loss of foreign markets for wheat, apples, pears, and prunes, and the need for increased production of such foods as dairy and poultry products, and certain vegetables and fruits for defense. The lack of certain specialty and seed crops formerly imported was cited as a problem of recent development.

The committees said there is need to determine where and how shifts in crop and livestock production are to be made most effectively. They recommended that in order to obtain such adjustments the State and Federal agencies should make marketing quotas, commodity loans, and surplus removal activities contingent upon farmers' compliance with production adjustment goals.

Other recommendations for agricultural adjustment included a proposal for making marketing agreements, quotas, and commodity loans available for any commodity when two-thirds of the producers vote in favor of such controls and loans, extension of the food stamp plan to

low-income families not on relief, and financing of surplus removal as a general welfare rather than as a farm relief measure.

Marketing and Distribution

Marketing and distribution problems are especially acute for farmers of the northwest region because of the long distance from major markets, it was pointed out. Studies were recommended to determine where savings can be made. Increased efforts in cooperative marketing were urged. Farmers were advised to stand by their cooperatives and not withdraw to take advantage of temporary situations.

The committees further recommended that cooperative memberships be kept continually informed of conditions and marketing problems, that investigations of marketing practices be made in the field before and at the time of marketing, and that investigation and adjustment of freight rates be given added attention.

Rural Works Program

The problem of providing useful work for unemployed and underemployed rural people was considered by the committees in terms of a rural works program and rural industries. Major emphasis was placed on preparing now for the post-defense situation when defense industries and military organizations release large numbers for peacetime activities. The committees urged that long range planning for public works should stress projects of reforestation, forest and range improvement, fire protection, reclamation works, rural roads, and weed control.

Mentioned as possibilities for further study were rural industries such as electric smelters, potato starch factories, clay

manufacturing, fiber processing, pulp and paper plants, spray materials, nitrate and phosphate fertilizers and sodium chlorates for noxious weed control.

Readjustment after the War

Looking forward to a period of readjustment after the defense effort, the committees stressed the idea that agritulture should not be forced to provide land and homes for large numbers of defense workers who may then be unemployed. It would be unfair to these workers and their families, the committees said, if they were given no alternative but to waste their resources and labor on farms too small or too poor to provide more than a miserable subsistence.

Another point on post-war readjustment was that non-defense spending should be curbed during the defense period, and that all construction and reclamation work be carefully planned as a means of providing employment after the war is over. In addition, when new land is brought into production, appropriate planning should be done to prevent glutting of existing markets, it was stated.

Land Use Policies and Tenure

Recommendations were made on land use policies. Prevention of settlement on submarginal lands, relocation and rehabilitation of families now on such land, and the development and management of land unsuited or unneeded for farming were considered chiefly as part of a long-time program to meet post-war needs.

Major recommendations included the purchase of submarginal land under authority of the Bankhead-Jones Act; long-term financial

assistance for farm development on good land; the classification and zoning of submarginal land against settlement; an educational program of settler guidance; and the classification and development of cut-over land for their most appropriate uses, including timber growing, grazing and farming.

Another problem considered by the committees had to do with land tenure. Idaho and Washington stated that competition for land had forced prices upward to the detriment of the tenant. The two committees pointed out that one consequence of this is quickened destruction of soil resources; another is the difficulty experienced by young farmers in getting established on farms; still another is the situation of many migrant families who, for lack of better opportunities, live in abandoned cabins in cut-over areas.

Other Problems

The committees considered local government and taxation problems arising out of large public land holdings, extensive areas requiring rural roads, settlement on poor lands, the financing of fire protection, and the depletion of the tax base by liquidation of private timber holdings. To deal with these and related problems proposals included rural zoning, payments in lieu of taxes on public lands, the fitting of road programs to land use conditions, a study of tax levies for fire protection, and a study of fiscal relationship between State and county governments.

LATEST RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEES

****

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Idaho Washington Oregon

June 30, 1941

IDAHO

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

J. A. Chamberlin, Director, Statewide Highway Planning Survey, Boise
E. J. Iddings, Director of Extension, Chairman, Moscow
C. Van Clark, State Land Commissioner, Boise
C. W. Hungerford, Vice Director, Agri. Experiment Station, Moscow
E. V. Berg, State Reclamation Commissioner, Boise
Franklin Girard, State Forester, Boise
William Kerr, Office of Vocational Education, Boise
James B. Newport, State Commissioner of Agriculture, Boise

Farmer Members		Counties
L. W. Anderson, Hill City		Elmore
F. G. Butler, Albion	(County Com.)	Cassia
A. G. Condie, Preston	(County Com.)	Franklin
Mrs. Wm. Giffels, Weiser	(County Com.)	Washington
C. W. Gresham, Midas	(County Com.)	Bonner
E. A. Hall, Emmett	(County Com.)	Gem
Mrs. Dicey W. Henderson, Arimo		Bannock
R. E. Hughes, Idaho Falls	(County Com.)	Bonneville
Guy Kitch, Troy		Latah
H. L. Lowe, Aberdeen	(County Com.)	Bingham
Mrs. J. M. Pierce, Twin Falls		Twin Falls
L. E. Pool, Hazelton	(County Com.)	Jerome
A. F. Rasmussen, Roxburg	(County Com.)	Madison
Ward A. Sewell, Lucille	(County Com.)	Idaho
J. A. Tarter, Weiser	(County Com.)	Washington
S. G. Tucker, Parma	(County Com.)	Canyon
Mrs. Mary Nelson, St. Maries		
Tony Wessels, Greencreek		

Cooperating Agencies

G. E. Holman, State Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Boise
E. E. Kidder, Senior Engineer, Public Roads Admin., Boise
J. F. Stoblein, Grazing Service, Pocatello

USDA Representatives

Carl Tjerandsen, BAE Representative, Secretary, Moscow
R. N. Irving, State Coordinator, SCS, Moscow
G. B. Mains, Forest Supervisor, USFS, Boise
C. C. Rowan, Rehabilitation Manager, Fed'l Land Bank, FCA, Spokane, Wash.
Milford Vaught, Chairman State AAA Committee
R. W. Purcell, FSA, Boise

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Rex E. Willard, 222 Mercantile Bldg., Berkeley, California

WASHINGTON

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

F. E. Balmer, Chairman, Director of Extension, Pullman
Edward C. Johnson, Director of Experiment Station, Pullman
Ted Goodyear, State Forester, Olympia
Pat Hetherton, State Planning Council, Olympia
J. W. Kalkus, Supt. Western Washington Exp. Sta., Puyallup
A. E. Cox, Director, State Deptartment of Agr., Walla Walla
H. C. Higgins, State Highway Deptartment, Olympia

Farmer Members		Counties
Ivan Compton, Wonatchee.	(County Com.)	Chelan
J. M. McGregor, Hooper		Whitman
W. J. Adair, Carnation	(County Com.)	King
William A. Wolf, Latah		Spokane
Mrs. George Keys, East Sound	(County Com.)	San Juan
Mrs. W. C. Brondt, Ellensburg	(County Com.)	Kittitas
Mrs. Ruth Livingston, Pasco	(County Com.)	Franklin
Grant P. Gleason	(County Com.)	Lewis

Cooperating Agencies

W. H. Lynch, District Engineer, Public Roads Administration, Portland, Oregon
J. F. Finley, District Agent, Fish and Wildlife Service, Seattle, Washington

USDA Representatives

Edwin F. Landerholm, Secretary, BAE Representative, Pullman
Henry B. Ramsey, Chairman State AAA Committee, Grandview
H. B. Carroll, State Coordinator, SCS, Pullman
John C. Kuhns, Ass't Regional Forester, Forest Service, Portland, Oregon
W. R. Moulton, REA
E. J. Bell, Ass't General Agent, FCA, Spokane, Washington
H. E. Drew, State Director, FSA, Olympia
H. H. Gurley, Forest Service, Missoula, Montana

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Rex E. Willard, 222 Mercantile Building, Berkeley, California

OREGON

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

David Eccles, Executive Secretary to the Governor, Salem
C. B. McCullough, Ass't State Highway Engineer, Salem
N. S. Rogers, State Forester, Salem
Wm. A. Schoenfeld, Director, Experiment Station and Extension Service
E. G. Mason, School of Forestry, Oregion State College, Corvallis
W. L. Teutsch, Ass't Director, Extension Service, Corvallis

Farmer Members		Counties
Ernest L. Clauson, Broadbent	(County Committee)	Coos
C. W. Craddock, Silvies	(County Committee)	Grant
Hubert Koons, Lakeview	(County Committee)	Lake
George Peck, Lexington	(County Committee)	Morrow
John Ramage, Woodburn	(County Committee)	Marion
Paul H. Spillman, Powell Butte	(County Committee)	Crook
R. P. Laird, Creswell	(County Committee)	Lane
C. H. Wendt, Medford	(County Committee)	Jackson

Cooperating Agencies

Jasper W. Elliott, Supt., Warm Springs Indian Reservation, Office Indian Affairs
B. E. Haydon, Supervisor, Bureau of Reclamation, Klamath Falls
W. H. Horning, Chief Forester, O & C Administration, Portland
Harry E. Mitchell, Public Roads Administration, Salem
Nic Monte, Regional Grazier, Grazing Service, Burns
A. S. Einarsen, Fish and Wildlife Service, Corvallis

USDA Representatives

James C. Moore, BAE Representative, Secretary
F. H. Brundage, Associate Regional Forester, Portland
N. C. Donaldson, State Executive Officer, AAA, Portland
V. F. Livesay, State Director, Rehabilitation, FSA, Portland
S. T. White, State Coordinator, SCS, Corvallis

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Rex E. Willard, 222 Mercantile Building, Berkeley, California

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C.

August, 1941.

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
★ SEP 19 1941 ★
U.S. Department of Agriculture

REGIONAL SUMMARY OF STATE LAND USE PLANNING REPORTS TO AID IN DEFENSE AND MEET THE IMPACTS OF WAR

THE SOUTHWEST REGION

Early this year Secretary Wickard requested the aid of State land use planning committees in shaping the course of agriculture and the government's agricultural programs during the defense emergency. In response to this request, each State committee drafted a set of recommendations for action to meet the impacts of war and to forward the defense program. These State reports were then summarized by regions in regional conferences held June 16 to June 24.

The major recommendations from the report for the southwest region are outlined below. The States comprising this region are Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah.

The State land use planning committees, which drafted the original reports, are composed of representatives of State and Federal agencies and of farmers from each type-of-farming area in their State. In turn the State committees are one of three levels of agricultural planning committees. The other two are community committees, composed entirely of farmers, and county committees composed of farmers and county representatives of State and Federal agencies, with farmers predominating. A list of the State committee members for the southwest region is attached.

Copies of the national report also are available.

The program outlined by the State committees of the Southwest at a recent regional conference at Salt Lake City dealt with special defense situations; health and nutrition; education and information; farm labor; conservation of natural resources; production, prices, and farm management; marketing and transportation; Pan-American relations; agricultural finance; a rural works program; and local government.

Special Situations Arising out of the Defense Program

The committees from California, Colorado, Nevada, and Arizona said there was a need for coordination between the military and land use planning committees. They suggested, however, that most of the difficulties could be ironed out through conferences between planning committees and military leaders and Corps Area Headquarters.

The California and Colorado committees declared that the land use planning committees could be of material assistance in planning to take care of housing and social problems at defense centers. California, Colorado and Nevada recommended that since the danger of incendiarism and sabotage was very great in farm and forest areas, plans should be made for increased Federal participation and for intensive organization of local fire fighting facilities.

Health and Nutrition

Health was recognized as a basic problem throughout the region, and all State committees recommended programs to provide proper nutrition, adequate medical facilities, and improved housing. Specific suggestions included home production and preservation of food, improved food habits, expansion of the food stamp plan, medical and dental care, hospitalization, sanitation measures, and special subsidy or credit arrangements for housing construction. The general policy in all States was one of alleviating the health problem by every means possible including assistance from rural people as well as county, State, and Federal agencies.

Education and Information

Recommendations on education came from all States, and urged a change of emphasis from the customary type of training to more practical courses that would better fit people to meet the problems of rural living. Changes in school

curricula, encouragement of youth organizations, and expanded adult education are involved in these programs.

Means suggested by New Mexico, Colorado and California for aiding with educational work included the development of informational services and organization of study and discussion groups. Education on all phases of agriculture was recommended.

Changes recommended by Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah in the curricula of public schools were directed primarily toward State and county governmental units. Action by farmers and ranchmen was implied in organized study and discussion programs.

Farm Labor

The chief emergency aspect of the farm labor problem, according to all the State committees, was the need for a sufficient supply of workers to meet farm labor requirements. To replace farm workers now being drawn into defense and allied industries, and into the armed forces, New Mexico, California, Colorado, and Utah recommended that the possibility of employing local people not usually engaged in farm work be explored. These individuals were expected to become available through temporary closing or restricting of WPA, NYA, and other public assistance projects, through adjusting school dates so as to make school pupils available, and through educational programs to urge complete registration at employment offices of all seeking work.

In addition to increasing the labor supply from local sources, recommendations also were made by California, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Nevada, seeking to achieve an efficient distribution and utilization of available local labor, and to encourage the movement of workers from one locality ao another as seasonal needs require. Laborers and employers were both encouraged to make use of the public employment offices; employers were urged to register their labor needs with these offices as far in advance as possible. Land use planning committees and public agencies were requested by the same five States to work with the public employment offices in developing supply-demand information by localities in order that these facts might serve as a basis for efficient distribution and use of a restricted labor supply.

Recommendations made by California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah dealt with aspects which are long-term as well as emergency and call for: (a) vocational training of farm workers, (b) improved housing, (c) provision of transportation, (d) extension of the food and cotton stamp plan to make low-income agricultural families eligible regardless of relief status, (e) possible means of controlling labor contractors, (f) diversification of agriculture to stabilize labor needs, and (g) improved tenure for farm workers.

Conservation of Natural Resources

State committees throughout the region all indorsed the policy of conservation. Protection of watershed lands stood out as the most important problem in this connection. Recommendations outlined the proper management practices for forest, range, and farm lands under various uses.

The approach varied with the phase of the conservation problem being considered and the characteristics of the area involved. Suggestions made by California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and Arizona, included organization of sub-committees of State and county committees to assist in outlining policies, sustained yield timber cutting, fire and insect protection, forest credit systems, coordination of administrative policies, development of roads, proper wildlife management, and education on forestry, wildlife, range and farm problems.

Range problems vary widely in the Southwest, the summary of the State reports indicated, but can be ameliorated through proper range management practices and internal unit reorganization. Farmers and ranchmen were cautioned against exploitation and over-development and were urged to bring about proper land use within their operating units.

Because of its importance in the arid and semi-arid regions, emphasis was placed on conservation, development and proper use of water. Colorado, Utah, and

New Mexico recommended expansion of water use only after thorough study of competitive use and determination of maximum benefits.

The problem of conservation is so broad that all levels of activity are involved in its solution, the summary pointed out. Recommendations directed toward the Department of Agriculture by Arizona and New Mexico were for permitting a five-year range improvement program to be completed in one year with subsequent conservation payments applying to works constructed, and the full use of the 20 percent of grazing fees for range improvement permitted under existing regulations.

Production, Prices, and Farm Management

State programs emphasized that a major objective of production adjustment and control measures was to assure agriculture a fair share of the national income. Because of the complicated situation which exists, the summary indicated, a farm adjustment program is essential. All States felt that benefits must be based upon conservation compliance and in addition should include marketing quotas, marketing loans, storage, crop insurance, and surplus removal. New Mexico and Colorado recommended that programs be financed by direct appropriations from the Federal Government. For this reason it was considered essential by all States that not only should growers be fully informed of the merits of the program, but that the general public also should understand how the national welfare is being served.

The State committees all urged that the period of better prices, which is resulting from defense production, be used to put the farm plant in condition to weather the inevitable adjustment period which will come when the war is over. Any increase in income should be used to pay off debts. Reserves of feed should be accumulated. Also, farm families should become as self-sufficient as possible by production for home use of dairy and poultry products, and fruits and

vegetables. In order to bring this about, the States recommended that further action be taken to supplement the farm income by reducing expenses and inaugurating home improvement programs by the Extension Service, Farm Security Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and other action and educational agencies. It was also recommended that cooperative service programs be made available to producer groups.

Marketing and Transportation

More specific local information on prices and grades was recommended by State committees from California, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah. The value of the Food Stamp Plan in correcting surplus situations was recognized by all States. Colorado and New Mexico warned farmers against rigid future contracts.

A complex situation involving water, railway, and truck transportation relationships was recognized in the region by New Mexico, California, and Colorado, but no definite conclusions were developed. The desire was for closer integration of rates and services.

Pan-American Relations

The recommendations on Pan-American trade relations made by Colorado, New Mexico, and California generally favored "give and take" cooperation with South America to achieve close military and economic integration. They recommended united action on the common problems of hemispheric surpluses and suggested careful consideration of products and forms of products which we may import. Recommendations were made by Colorado and New Mexico regarding the equalization of trade effects between agriculture and industry and the development of industrial self-sufficiency in South America.

Agricultural Finance

The committees from New Mexico, Colorado, California, and Utah cautioned farmers against the unwise use of credit during the present emergency, and against over-expansion of operations and over-capitalization. Farmers were urged in this connection to make a careful study of their individual finance and credit needs in relation to changing market conditions, price fluctuations, and conservative use of the land. It was stated that present policies of Federal credit agencies are acceptable in all parts of the region.

Rural Works Programs

Planning of a public works program to include rural projects was recommended by Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and California as being beneficial in two ways: (a) to insure workers ready employment when defense spending tapers off, and (b) to provide supplementary income on a non-relief basis to low-income farm families on public projects with employment so scheduled as not to conflict with farming activities. County land use planning committees were urged to cooperate with action agencies in planning community projects that would provide supplemental employment for low-income farm families.

Local Government

No general consideration of local governmental problems was included in committee reports. Recommendations were made by Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah for studies of taxation problems, legislation enabling county consolidation, additional State and Federal support for vocational education, and special assistance to low-income farmers.

- - -Y- - -

LATEST RECORD OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEES

****

SOUTHWEST

Arizona
California
Colorado
Nevada
New Mexico
Utah

June 30, 1941

ARIZONA

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

Charles U. Pickrell, Director of Extension Service, Chairman, Tucson
Paul S. Burgess, Director of Experiment Station, Tucson

Farmer Members		Counties
Roy Barclay, Yuma	(County Com.)	Yuma
W. E. Wiltbank, Springerville		Apache
C. L. McKinney, Courtland	(County Com.)	Cochise
Henry Hutchison, Flagstaff		Coconino
Louie P. Horrell, Globe		Gila
M. M. Hancock, Pima	(County Com.)	Graham
A. M. Creighton, Route 6, Phoenix		Maricopa
Nat M. Dysart, Peoria		Maricopa
Cecil H. Miller, Phoenix		Maricopa
Joe M. King, Tucson		Pima
L. W. Klene, Elgin		Santa Cruz
Carl Rees, Chino Valley	(County Com.)	Yavapai
J. E. Browning	(County Com.)	Cochise
C. V. Hanna	(County Com.)	Pinal
Phil Harris	(County Com.)	Yavapai
Jesse Smith	(County Com.)	Navajo

Cooperating Agencies

G. L. McLean, Public Roads Administration, Phoenix

USDA Representatives

Robert F. Black, BAE Representative, Secretary, Tucson
J. C. Jamieson, Chairman AAA, Phoenix
F. E. Webb, Assistant State Director, FSA, Phoenix
Allen F. Kinnison, State Coordinator, SCS, Tucson
Arthur A. Upson, Director of Southwest Forest and Range Exp. Sta., Tucson
W. D. Ellis, General Agent, Farm Credit Administration, Berkeley
G. E. Tarleton, Area Director, Surplus Marketing Administration, Phoenix

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Rex E. Willard, 222 Mercantile Building, Berkeley, California

CALIFORNIA

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

B. H. Crocheron, Director of Extension Service, Chairman, Berkeley
C. B. Hutchison, Agricultural Experiment Station, Berkeley
W. J. Cecil, State Department of Agriculture, San Francisco

Farmer Members	Counties
Sam Robinson, R.D. #1, Box 60, Imperial	Imperial
W. L. Smith, Buttonwillow	Kern
Tro Emerson, Susanville	Lassen
Geo. P. Clements, c/o Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles	Los Angeles
Ben Hayes, R. F. D., Madera	Madera
Arnold Frew, King City	Monterey
William Darsie, Walnut Grove	Sacramento
Wilmer Trussell, San Marcos	San Diego
Nels Beck, Pozo	San Luis Obispo
George Sawyer, Waterford	Stanislaus
Earl Lindauer, Los Molinos	Tehama
A. T. Spencer, Gerber	Tehama
C. L. Guthrie, 627 Mill Street, Porterville	Tulare
L. J. Falion, R.F.D., Marysville	Yuba

Cooperating Agencies

Phil Dickinson, Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation

USDA Representatives

Dave Davidson, Chairman State Agricultural Conservation Comm., Berkeley
Rex E. Willard, Regional BAE Representative, Berkeley
Willard Ellis, General Agent, FCA, Berkeley
L. I. Howes, Regional Director, FSA, San Francisco
R. B. Cozzens, State Coordinator, SCS, Berkeley
C. F. Kunkel, Acting Regional Director, SMA
C. B. Morse, Assistant Regional Forester, USFS

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Rex E. Willard, 222 Mercantile Building, Berkeley, California

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

F. A. Anderson, Chairman, Director of Extension
Dr. I. E. Newsom, Director of Experiment Station
R. E. Ford, State Forester
J. E. Furlong, State Highway Department
E. D. Foster, State Planning Commission

Farmer Members

		County
Howard Bailey	(County Com.)	Routt
Paul Swisher	"	Delta
Harvey Mathias	"	Rio Grande
Ross Stephens	"	Boulder
Albert Lindstrom	"	Logan
Hacket Smartt	"	Prowers
C. E. Blumenshine	"	Mesa
Victor Paulek	"	LaPlata
Chas. E. White	"	Fremont
Jacob Lebsack	"	Logan
J. E. Stubbs	"	Elbert
E. N. Hewitt	"	Bent
Mrs. Jeannette G. Salberg		Weld
Mrs. E. Pachand		Rio Grande
Mrs. S. L. Horker		Cheyenne
Mrs. E. M. Nelson		Fremont
Mrs. R. M. Hamilton		Larimer
Miss Ruth Coffman		Mesa
Mrs. Myrtle Van Dorn		Moffat

Cooperating Federal Agencies

W. J. Keller, Acting District Engineer, Public Roads Administration
P. T. Quick, Fish & Wildlife Service
R. B. Rose, Grazing Service

USDA Representatives

James C. Foster, State BAE Representative
G. E. Brown, Chairman State Committee, Agricultural Adjustment Admn.
Lionel C. Holm, State Director, Region 12, FSA
R. E. Kiely, Farm Credit Administration
K. W. Chalmers, State Coordinator, SCS
Allen S. Peck, Regional Forester, Forest Service
F. R. Merrifield, Director of Research, FCA

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

James C. Foster, Land Office Bldg., Colorado State College, Fort Collins, Colo.

NEVADA

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

Robert A. Allen, State Highway Engineer and Chairman State Planning Board
T. E. Buckman, Acting Director of Agricultural Extension, Chairman
Samuel B. Doten, Director of the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station
Mrs. Florence Bovett, Executive Secretary, Nevada State Farm Bureau

Farmer Members		Counties
Peter Henrichs, Yerington	(County Committee)	Lyon
Percy Mills, Fallon	(County Committee)	Churchill
W. U. Schofield, Hiko	(County Committee)	Lincoln
Jeames H. Day, Wellington	(County Committee)	Lyon
Edwin W. Marshall, Logandale	(County Committee)	Clark
H. K. Harvey, Paradise Valley		Humboldt
Edward Godecke, Gardnerville	(County Committee)	Douglas
Leo Sauer, RFD, Carson City		Washoe
George Ogilvie, Lee		Elko
George Miller, Paradise Valley		Humboldt
E. R. Marvel, Battle Mountain		Lander
Arthur Carter, Lund	(County Committee)	White Pine
W. W. Carpenter, Lovelock	(County Committee)	Pershing
Mrs. Winona Drown, Elko	(County Committee)	Elko
Mrs. Verna Sadler, Eureka		Eureka
Jim Butler, Tonopah		Nye

Cooperating Agencies

C. H. Hansen, State Supervisor, Fish and Wild Life Service, Reno
Lester Brooks, Regional Grazier, Grazing Service
Don C. Foster, Superintendent, Carson Indian Agency
C. H. Sweetser, Public Roads Administration, San Francisco, California
F. M. Spencer, Acting Construction Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, Reno

USDA Representatives

Cruz Venstrom, State BAE Representative, Secretary
George Hardman, State Coordinator, SCS
Alexander McQueen, Supervisor, Toiyabe National Forest
Robert J. Bankofier, State Director, FSA
E. A. Settelmeyer, Chairman, Nevada Agricultural Conservation Committee, AAA
W. D. Ellis, Farm Credit Administration, Berkeley, California

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Rex E. Willard, 222 Mercantile Building, Berkeley, California

NEW MEXICO

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

J. A. Tadlock, Unemployment Compensation Commission
Mrs. J. M. Kirby, Department of Public Welfare
A. B. Fite, Director of Extension Service, Chairman
Fabian Garcia, Director of Experiment Station
B. G. Dwyre, Highway Engineer, State Highway Dept.
Thos. M. McClure, State Engineer, St. Engineer's Office
H. R. Rodgers, St. Commissioner, State Land Office
Elliott S. Barker, State Game Warden, State Game Dept.
Paul B. Harris, St. Tax Commissioner, St. Tax Commission
Frank Wimberly, Department of Ed. and Vocational Education
John Loughlin, State Planning Board
Dr. James Scott, State Health Department

Farmer and Rancher Members		Counties
A. D. Brownfield, Florida	(County Com.)	Luna
T. D. Casebolt, Estancia	"	Torrance
C. D. Clampitt, Obar	"	Quay
A. H. Gerdeman, Las Vegas	"	San Miguel
G. D. Hatfield, Deming	"	Luna
Charles Madrid, Las Cruces	"	Dona Ana
Jay R. Ogden, Loving	"	Eddy
Harry L. Parks, Lake Valley	"	Sierra
Herbert Parsons, Cobolla	"	Rio Arriba
Sam Romero, San Marcial	"	Socorro
Guy Rowe, Roswell	"	Chaves
Wade C. Smith, Crownpoint	"	McKinley
J. Hugh Stevenson, Hayden	"	Union
George D. Wiggins, Optimo	"	Mora
Mrs. Anna D. Cook, St. Vrain	"	Curry
Richard W. Curcton, Lordsburg		Midalgo
Floyd W. Leo, San Mateo	"	Valencia
Mrs. Calla K. Eylar, LaMosa	"	Dona Ana
Brice E. Bullok		Curry

Cooperating Federal Agencies

H. A. Tollson, National Park Service
C. F. Dierking, Regional Grazier, Division of Grazing
John D. Slye, Sr. Highway Engineer, Public Roads Administration
S. D. Aberle, Gen. Supt. of Pueblos, Indian Service
E. C. Cates, District Agent, Fish & Wildlife Service
Edwin R. Henson, Coordinator, So. Great Plains Div.
A. L. Hurt, Executive Secy., Interdepartmental Rio Grande Bd.
J. J. Connelly, W. P. A.

Continued

NEW MEXICO (cont'd.)

USDA Representatives

Fred Daniels, Agricultural Marketing Service
Ralph Charles, BAE Representative, Secretary
J. V. Taylor, State Coordinator, SCS
Ralph R. Will, State Director, FSA
Frank C. W. Pooler, Regional Forester, Forest Service
Fred L. O'Cheskey, Chairman State Committee of AAA
Fred Merrifield, Farm Credit Association
Harry Slattery, Rural Electrification Administration
J. H. Jenkins, Surplus Commodities Corporation

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

James C. Foster, Land Office Bldg., Colorado State College, Ft. Collins, Colo.

UTAH

STATE LAND-USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

State Agencies

William Peterson, Director of Extension Service, Logan, Chairman
Myrtle Davidson, Assistant Director Extension, Logan
W. W. Owens, Asst. Director of Extension Service, Logan
R. H. Walker, Director of Experiment Station, Logan
H. Warren Taylor, Executive Secretary, State Land Board
C. E. Hill, State Highway Planning Engineer, State Rd. Comm., Salt Lake City
W. C. Holbrook, President, State Farm Bureau, Salt Lake City
G. A. Carpenter, Extension Service, Logan
S. J. Boyer, Utah Farm Bureau, Salt Lake City
Tracy R. Welling, State Commissioner of Agriculture, Salt Lake City

Farmer Members	County
Ella V. Reeder, Brigham	Box Elder
George F. Stallings, Eden	Weber
A. B. Barton, Kaysville	Davis
Geo. B. Andrus, Salt Lake City	Salt Lake
W. C. Whiting, Charleston	Wasatch
Wilford Day, Parowan	Iron
Lottie Kimball, Kanosh	Millard
G. M. Hunt, Bicknell	Wayne
Zula C. Nielson, Richfield	Sevier
Elmer Lind, Vernal	Uintah
Ione Conover, Ferron	Emery
Mary Marcusen	Utah

Cooperating Federal Agencies

J. Howard Maughan, Economist, Water Utilization, Logan
Albert C. Spann, Public Roads Administration, Salt Lake City
R. S. Zimmerman, Fish and Wildlife Service, Salt Lake City
E. G. Nielsen, Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake City
L. Waine Larson, Division of Grazing, Salt Lake City

USDA Representatives

Dilworth Walker, BAE Representative, Logan, Secretary
A. Golden Kilburn, Executive Director, AAA, Logan
Ethelyn O. Greaves, Area Supervisor, FSA, Logan
G. S. Quate, State Coordinator, SCS, Logan
Willard D. Ellis, Director, FCA, Berkeley, California
C. J. Olsen, Assistant Regional Forester, U. S. Forest Service, Ogden
Clark Allred, District Supervisor, FSA, Provo
James E. Gurr, Supervisor, Wasatch National Forest, Ogden

Regional Representative, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Rex E. Willard, 222 Mercantile Bldg., Berkeley, California